DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 338 EA 012 794

AUTHOR Davies, Don; And Others
TITLE Patterns of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking. Volume I. Overview of the Status of Citizen Participation.
INSTITUTION Institute for Responsive Education, Boston, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 78
CONTRACT 400-76-0115
NOTE 123p.; Prepared as part of "Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking." For a related document, see EA 012 795.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Citizen Participation; *Community Control; *Decision Making; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Government School Relationship; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; *Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; *Political Power; School Community Relationship; *School Policy; Voluntary Agencies

ABSTRACT

This report explores the individual and social benefits of citizen participation in educational decision-making. This exploration combines democratic theory, historical and cultural determinants, practical experience and public opinion, and research and evaluation. Citizens participate politically in school affairs to effect changes in policy, service delivery, community development, performance of students in school, and organizational effectiveness. Chapter 1 presents a summary of the historical and cultural determinants of these patterns of citizen participation. Chapter 2 describes the powerful and growing influence of state and federal government actions on citizen participation. Chapter 3 raises, and in part answers, the questions: Who participates, how, and in what issues? Chapter 4 summarizes the available evidence on the impact of citizen participation. In the final chapter, the principal author provides a personal perspective on the current status and meaning of citizen participation. Data for this report are drawn from a variety of sources including approximately 300 open-ended interviews with decision-makers. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 5 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 188338

Patterns of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking

Volume I: Overview

Don Davies
with Miriam Clasby,
Ross Zerchykov and Brian Powers

November 1978

EA 012 794

Prepared as part of Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking by the Institute for Responsive Education for the Program on Educational Policy and Organization of the National Institute of Education

PATTERNS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

IN EDUCATIONAL DECISIONMAKING

Volume I: Overview of
the Status of Citizen Participation

Don Davies
with Miriam Clasby, Ross Zerchykov and Brian Powers

Prepared as part of Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking by the Institute for Responsive Education. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract Number 400-76-0115 with the Program on Educational Policy and Organization of the National Institute of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this report was primarily the responsibility of Don Davies, President of the Institute for Responsive Education. In this undertaking he drew on his five years of experience as Associate Commissioner and then Deputy Commissioner for Development in the United States Office of Education.

In this effort he was assisted by Miriam Clasby, Associate Director of IRE, and Director of the Collaborative which links Boston University with 14 Boston schools and their Community District Advisory Council. A former chairperson of the editorial board of the Harvard Educational Review, she also has served as Project Director at the Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse. Her report, Laws, Tests, and Schooling, co-authored with Maureen Webster, provided the conceptual framework for the data analysis presented in Chapter II of this report.

Continuing assistance was provided by Ross M. Zerchykov. Zerchykov, with a degree in Political Theory from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, is currently writing a doctoral dissertation in Political Science at Boston University. An IRE Research Associate, he co-authored, with Don Davies, Citizen Participation in Education: Annotated Bibliography, a companion volume to this report. He is also working on an IRE action research project on school advisory councils.

Brian Powers also helped to prepare this report. Powers, with a degree in Social Studies from Harvard University, is a former journalist and current IRE Research Associate. Powers is co-director of a project concerning community participation in declining enrollment, supported by the Rockefeller Family Fund.

Other valuable contributions have been made by Alison Ridley Evans, IRE's Senior Editor and Jane de Groot, who provided overall technical assistance and editing. Special thanks go to Constance Hyde, Dana Rudolph and Esperanza Tome, who handled the extensive typing. We also gratefully acknowledge the invaluable support of Bernice Randell, IRE's Administrative Assistant.

In addition, we especially want to thank the hundreds of people we interviewed all over the country. A complete list of interviewees is available at the Institute for Responsive Education.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION	12
Historical Determinants: The Old and the New Reforms	12
The Old Reform	13
The Legacy of the Old Reform	16
The New Reform: The Activism of the 1960's	20
New Participants	20
"New Reform": The Movement for Community Control of Schools	22
Cultural Contradictions	26
Desegregation Threatens Existing Life Patterns	26
Social and Cultural Contradictions	27
Schools Viewed as Social Economic Escalator	29
Schools Face Unresolved Conflicts Over Race and Ethnicity	29
Female Members Predominate in Citizen Organizations	31
Summary: Civic Competency and Populism	31
CHAPTER II. FEDERAL AND STATE INFLUENCE	36
The Federal Influence	37
Head Start: A Power Sharing Model	39
Follow Through: Linking Parents and Pupil Achievements	39

Page

Title I 41
Urban/Rural School Development Program 43
General Patterns of Limitations 44

The Influence of State Governments 46

Increased State Role in the 1970's 47
Survey of State Actions 48

CHAPTER III. WHO PARTICIPATES? HOW? AND IN WHAT ISSUES? 56

Functions of Participation 56

How Citizens Participate 58

Individual Participation 58
Collective Participation 60
Mandated Forms 61
Voluntary Forms 61
Voluntary, Multi-Issue Groups with Educational Agendas 63
Child Advocacy Groups 65

Who Participates? 65

Numbers of Participants 65
The New Participants 67
New Participants: Immigrant Streams 68
New Participants: White Ethnics 68
New Participants: Suburban Activists 69
Traditional Patterns Persist 70
Summary and Conclusions 73

In What Issues? 73

Factors Shaping the Issues 74
Desegregation is Predominant Issue 74

Summary: Interrelationships 77

The Dynamics Vary from Place to Place 77
Issues Shape the Dynamics 77
Organizational Census 78
Technical and Professional Forms and Functions Predominate 80

CHAPTER IV: WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION? 87

		Page
	Impact on Policy	87
	Examples from Federal Programs	88
	Impact of School Policies	89
	Summary	90
	Impact on Service Delivery	91
	Paraprofessionalism: Individual Participation Can Lead to Increased Capacity of Schools	92
	Collective Participation: Mandated and Voluntary Citizen Efforts to Improve Service Delivery	92
	Impact on Student Performance	93
	Studies of Parent Participation	93
	Summary: What Do the Studies Prove?	95
	Impact on Participants	96
	Tangible Individual Benefits: Careers and Job Opportunities	96
	Intangible Individual Benefits: Increases in Civic Competency	96
CHAPTER V:	SUMMING UP	102
	Conflicting Interest Groups Impair the Public Good	102
	Citizen Challenge to Professional Domination	104
	The Scoreboard - What Does It All Mean?	106
	Why Collaboration? Schools Can't Do Their Job Alone	106

FOREWORD

PATTERNS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL DECISIONMAKING is a status report on citizen participation in educational decisionmaking organized in two volumes; these can be read separately but are closely interconnected and interdependent.

Volume I, An Overview of the Status of Citizen Participation, is an interpretative essay by Don Davies, establishing an ideological framework and historical and cultural context, including the influence of government interventions and summarizing information and ideas about who participates, on what issues and in what ways. Included is a summary of evidence about the impact of citizen participation on policy, service, delivery, student performance and participants.

Volume II, Diverse and Shifting Forms of Participation, considers in more detail a variety of channels for participation. Chapters are devoted to each of four major forms of participation: community control and decentralization, school councils and advisory committees, grassroots neighborhood associations, and child advocacy groups.

The two-volume report is one of several resulting from the first year of a 33-month research project by the Institute for Responsive Education. The Education and Human Resources Development Division of Optimum Computer Systems, Inc., (OCS) was the major subcontractor for the first half of the study. The Research Foundation of the City University of New York is the subcontractor for the second half of the study.

Entitled Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decisionmaking, the project is funded by the Program on Educational Policy and Organization of the National Institute of Education.

The principal purpose of the study is to increase understanding of ways in which organizations: (1) have impact on local decisionmaking; (2) work to increase the responsiveness of public institutions (e.g., schools and school systems) to the constituents they serve; and (3) enhance the power of minorities and of low-income residents. The study is particularly concerned about ways in which parents and other community members, especially urban minorities and the poor, participate in decisions that bear on the education of their children.

The other reports from the first year of the study are described below:

1. FEDERAL AND STATE IMPACT ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOLS.

   This report examines the impact of Federal policies on citizen participation, the effects of State legislation, the role of the courts and judicial activism, and, in particular, the role citizens have played across the country in the school desegregation issue.

2. SOCIAL SCIENCE THEORY AND RESEARCH ON PARTICIPATION AND VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS: A Bibliographic Essay.

   This review of theory and research on interest groups is intended for policymakers and researchers concerned with citizen participation in educational decisionmaking. Topics include the functions of participation, network analysis, ethnicity and political participation, the changing urban environment and the neighborhood government movement. Special attention is given to issues such as decentralization and community control.

3. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL DECISIONMAKING: An Annotated Bibliography.

   Updating a previous bibliography prepared by the Institute for Responsive Education in 1974, this publication provides annotations for more than 800 books, essays and articles on citizen participation.

4. A DIRECTORY OF STATE AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SERVING LOCAL CITIZEN GROUPS.

   Designed as a tool for citizens involved in schools, this resource directory appears in Citizen Action in Education, the national newsletter of the Institute for Responsive Education.

Continuing Activities

Following the first-year national study of current organizations and their activities, intensive investigations commenced in Atlanta, Boston and Los Angeles in fall 1977. In each city, a site coordinator and staff of part-time community researchers are using case study methodology, participant observations and survey techniques to study several citizen organizations for about 18 months. The organizations are being studied in the context of their sociopolitical environments.

The Principal Investigator for the 33-month study is Don Davies, President of the Institute for Responsive Education. Marilyn Gittel, well-known political scientist and researcher specializing in citizen participation, serves as Director of Research.

The Institute for Responsive Education (IRE) is a non-profit, pri-

vate organization, founded in 1973 by Don Davies to study and assist the process of citizen participation in educational decisionmaking. It is housed in the Department of System Development and Adaptation, School of Education, Boston University, where Davies is Chairperson and a professor.

For more information about this NIE-funded study of citizen organizations, or about the Institute for Responsive Education, write or call:

INSTITUTE FOR RESPONSIVE EDUCATION
704 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
(617) 353-3309

or

Berlin Kelly, Assistant Director
Program on Educational Policy and Organization
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 254-7932

INTRODUCTION

The search for the "one best system" and "the final answer" for the schools continues. So does the search for the "quick fix." In this connection citizen participation is widely discussed, widely written about both in educational and social science publications, and widely practiced in many different forms. How should the schools and their clients and communities relate? Is citizen participation, however defined, good or bad; helpful or hurtful? Should it be promoted or rejected? Does it lead to higher reading scores, more votes for the school budget, or more power for the have-nots of the society? How can we settle the education controversy, quiet the debate, spread innovations? What can we do--form an advisory committee for every school, create a citizen task force, adopt school-based management, open collective bargaining? In brief, what's the quick fix?

We cannot provide a final answer, nor a "quick fix." The patterns of participation in the 1970's are both contradictory and confusing. Citizen participation is not a single concept. No single theory or intellectual perspective can explain all its varied phenomena. Research can provide useful guidance but has limits when decisions must be made in keeping with practical politics or social values.

We believe, however, that we have some rich and useful insights from our past experience and from the data and ideas we have gathered over the past months.

In this report we explore the individual and social benefits of citizen participation in educational decisionmaking. This exploration combines democratic theory, historical and cultural determinants, practical experience and public opinion, and research and evaluation. Our work to date suggests that there are six general and overlapping categories useful for describing the ways in which citizens participate politically in school affairs. While recognizing that it is difficult to ascribe clear-cut motives to peoples' activities, it appears that people participate to effect changes in:

1. POLICY - Citizen participation can lead to institutional policies which are more responsive to the needs of the constituents and communities served. Citizen participation will contribute to developing school policies and practices which are more effective and equitable than institutionally developed ones.

2. SERVICE DELIVERY - Citizen participation can improve the nature and quality of educational services. The capacity of the institution to understand and solve educational problems is enhanced if parents and other citizens are part of the problem solving effort.

3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - Participation can help to develop a sense of efficacy and confidence on the part of the constituents of citizens' organizations. Participation may also provide other benefits to individuals: training, education, job advancement, money, personal status, and social pleasure.

5. PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS IN SCHOOL - Citizen participation can contribute to improved performance by students, with higher levels of academic achievement; lower rates of truancy, dropping out, vandalism, discipline problems, and violence; better student attitudes and behavior; and better postsecondary school opportunities in employment and education.

6. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - Participation can contribute to making citizen organizations more effective (it is both input and output; cause and effect).

Seeking these benefits through citizen participation has a long and varied history in the United States. In the public mind, schools in America have always been regarded as community institutions. This belief has produced a continuously changing context of role definitions among parents, students, taxpayers, political officials, and educational professionals. Questions of how the schools should relate to their communities and how they should be governed have always been complex and controversial. But in the past twenty years there has been heightened controversy--caused by the fact that new people sought to participate in new ways on new issues. Specifically, the urban poor in the 1960's aggressively challenged existing patterns of control in three areas--budget, curriculum, and personnel--which are at the heart of school policy.

Such challenges, initially a part of the Civil Rights movement, have broadened into a widespread citizen challenge to the ways schools and communities, educators and citizens relate to one another. This has resulted in profound changes in these relationships. These changes represent the "patterns of participation" which are described in subsequent pages of Volume I. Chapter I presents a summary of the historical and cultural determinants of these patterns of citizen participation. Chapter II describes the powerful and growing influence of State and Federal government actions on citizen participation. Three basic questions--Who participates? How? and In What Issues?--are raised and, in part, answered in Chapter III. Chapter IV summarizes the available evidence on the impact of citizen participation. In the final chapter, the principal author provides a personal perspective on the current status and meaning of citizen participation.

This volume is an overview and a general status report. It will be

most useful if read in tandem with Volume II which is built around case studies and descriptions of citizen participation in particular contexts.

Ideological Framework

Our primary focus is whether or not recent patterns of participation lead to increased sharing of educational decisionmaking between professionals and citizens. This focus derives from the social/political ideology that governs our work. It is important to make this framework explicit at the outset.

Fundamental assumptions about the democratic nature of decisionmaking in American society profoundly affect the thinking and activity of people who are involved politically in school-related activities. Most participants share the conviction that it is possible to bring about change in schools by exercising their rights as citizens to share government power over important and costly local institutions. Their participation is consistent with a tradition of civic activism resulting in a more stable and equitable social system in the United States. Yet when people embark on political efforts to change schools, they also make significant ideological choices by their decision to pursue one of a number of political strategies to attain their goals. These derive from the following conceptions of a democratic society.

The first strategy aims to redefine the key concept of democracy and to sell the new definition to the people. It is fashionable among many social scientists, educational reformers, and politicians, and is based on meritocratic values. Society, it argues, has become so technologically and politically complicated, the world has grown so interdependent, that ordinary people cannot be trusted to make policy decisions because they have insufficient knowledge to anticipate the consequences and implications of these decisions.

Such a meritocratic position asserts that the public interest can be best discovered and served by sophisticated planning, requiring the services of highly trained cadres of professionals, specialists and managers. Access to power is determined by merit--academic ability and technical skill.

The second strategy tries to change individuals themselves to live and function better within the system. This approach is strongly therapeutic, trying to help persons conform at the individual level. It seeks to promote stable behavior in individuals and help them to adjust to the dominant, sanctioned social values. A person's difficulties, its reasoning asserts, are self-induced or are self-generated. It rarely admits to changing what others see as external sources of people's problems in the existing order of things. Many educators, psychologists, social workers, and communications experts are prominent in the ranks of such thinkers.

The third strategy is characterized by the intent to create new opportunities for citizen participation and influence in government and

public institutions. To succeed, this strategy requires that decision-making power be decentralized and that civic literacy and competence be developed throughout the society. Such a strategy arises from a fundamental belief that persons affected by governments' decisions and institutional policies have an inalienable right to contribute to these decisions and policies. The right is not bestowed by politicians, administrators, or professionals. It need not be earned by demonstrations of competence or merit or the determination of experts. In a democracy, the right to participate and influence is taken for granted, as belonging to the people by definition. This point of view is often popularly labeled "participatory democracy."

This participatory strategy can be subdivided into two categories. The first is apolitical. Its advocates emphasize the value of participation for one's own individual development. Participation, it is argued, results in improved organizational efficiency and better service delivery, in a sense of control over one's life and heightened feelings of self-worth. Simultaneously, participants are learning practical problem solving skills. Techniques for this type of participation include participatory planning, group efforts in setting goals, and exercises in futurism.

The second category of participatory democracy is explicitly political. It emphasizes opportunities for citizens to participate in actual decisionmaking and determination of policy, in the allocation of resources and the governance of institutions. Its goal is twofold: to redistribute power and enhance civic competence. Techniques for achieving this include community organizing, information gathering for political and organizational ends, the dispersing of centralized power, advocacy of individual and class rights, and the use of collaborative decisionmaking.

These two currents of participatory democratic strategies for reform of institutions often flow along separate courses. They sometimes converge, blending political and apolitical thinking, but are not always completely compatible.

Our focus in this overview is on citizen participation in educational decisionmaking that is political, i.e., that aims at achieving change in schools by altering traditional power relations among school decisionmakers and opening policymaking and decisionmaking to parents and others in the community.

The full realization of this concept of participatory democracy requires more equitable political participation for those people now least powerful--the poor and members of minority groups. From this vantage point, political participation must be seen as a part of the Civil Rights movement--a long-term struggle on the part of various groups to advance their political and social interests and rights.

Sharing of power--between professionals and citizens and among racial, ethnic, and class groupings--is the ideological framework of

this report. We assume that citizen participation in political life at the local level in as ordinary a public institution as the public school is crucial if society as a whole is truly democratic. With DeTocqueville we wonder at the inconsistency that permits a people to elect its national leaders, yet does not deem them capable of democratically managing their local affairs. His comment over a century ago is instructive:

> To manage those minor affairs in which good sense is all that is wanted, the people are held to be unequal to the task; but when the government of the country is at stake the people are invested with immense powers. They are alternately made the play things of their ruler and his masters, more than kings and less than men...It is indeed difficult to conceive how men who have entirely given up the habit of self-government should succeed in making a proper choice of those by whom they are to be governed. And no one will ever believe that liberal, wise, and energetic government can even spring from the suffrages of a subservient people.

Our major interest is in organizations rather than individual forms of participation. People exercise their rights most effectively through citizen-initiated and government-mandated organizations. These groups can provide a strong link between established decisionmakers and the diverse needs and wishes of the aggregate of citizens in whose interest they supposedly work. Citizen organizations, as mediating agents, can protect minority viewpoints, work as countervailing forces on government authority, form important bonds with other organizations and with persons from other communities with different interests. At the local, State or national levels such organizations are also a means for citizens to develop their civic competence, confidence, and power for their own constituencies.

Other Legitimate Perspectives

While the material in this report stresses citizen participation as political and collective, we also recognize that it can take many other legitimate and worthy forms such as membership on a PTA open house committee, serving as a room mother or school volunteer, voting in a school board election or taking part in a parent education program. We do not dismiss or overlook the existence of such activities simply because we are focusing here on other forms of participation.

Terminology

Citizen participation is not a unitary concept. No single theoretical framework can encompass it. Consequently, any discussion of the issues raised by citizen participation must stipulate some definitions.

Citizen is used to refer to parents and other adult residents in a city or town. It normally excludes students, even though students are sometimes involved in some of the varied activities known as citizen

participation. It also excludes professional educators and school staff only to make the important distinction between non-educators and the professionals and other employees of the schools.

Participation, as we use it and as it is most commonly used, means taking part in activities providing a share in policymaking. We will use the term involvement to describe instances and structures in which citizens' only role is to validate or become an audience for prior policy decisions made elsewhere. (Involvement is also used to describe citizens' activities in non-policymaking roles, e.g., classroom volunteers, athletic or band booster clubs, tutoring, etc.)

Class is a term used to describe individuals' socio-economic status. It is a notoriously difficult concept to pin down especially since rival definitions of class reflect rival judgements about American society. Not having data to make distinctions based on levels of income or composite ideas of socio-economic status, we use occupation as the criterion for a twofold definition. Hereafter, working class refers to persons in manual, blue-collar occupations (including those who may be unemployed); middle class refers to persons in professional, credentialed white-collar occupations. This is irrespective of income, social background, and actual or attributed influence. Occasionally but very sparingly we use the term elite. This does not refer to some conspiratorial group but to publicly recognized de facto and de jure decision-makers.

We differentiate between citizen-initiated organizations and mandated organizations. The latter are those groups that are formed by action of a local school or school system, or by State or Federal legislative or executive action. A commonly used synonym for "citizen-initiated" is voluntary association.

Single vs. multi-issue is another useful descriptor of organizations. "Single" refers to groups organized around a shared interest in schools. "Multi" refers to groups which have a wider range of policy interests.

Citizens groups may also be classified by their geographic scope: national, statewide, citywide, and local, and by their organizational status: affiliated vs. non-affiliated. An affiliated group would be a local or citywide chapter of a state or national level organization.

Grassroots as it is used here is an adjective for groups and organizations and not individuals. A "grassroots" group is one which is citizen-initiated, non-affiliated and is local (neighborhood rather than citywide) in terms of its membership base and interest orientation. "Grassroots" makes no reference to a group's ideological position, its degree of internal democracy, or to the socio-economic status of its membership.

Data Base

Data for this report are drawn from a variety of sources summarized

below:

1. Approximately 300 open-ended interviews were conducted in the field by study staff members from September 1976 to May 1977. One hundred eighty-eight interviews were conducted in seven large cities: Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York and San Francisco. In each city we interviewed a number of decisionmakers including the superintendent of schools, the president and other members of the school board, the education editor of the major daily newspapers, the head of the teachers' union, the mayor's chief education aide, and key school administrators in the central district office, as well as other informed observers of school politics in each city.

In these cities, four to seven IRE staff members interviewed the staff director, officers, or members of ten to twenty different kinds of citizen organizations in field visits lasting three or four days. Briefer visits were also made by one staff member to Louisville, Houston and Denver.

Three visits were made to state capitols to interview State legislators, legislative staff members, State Department of Education officials, and observers of State educational politics. These took place in Denver, Sacramento and Tallahassee.

Interviews were conducted with foundation officials, staff members of NEA and AFT, the National School Boards Association, the Council of Great City Schools, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Committee for Citizens in Education, the National Coalition of Title I Parents, the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, the Office of Education Administrators, the Education Commission of the States, the Children's Defense Fund, the Federal Education Project of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law, and a variety of other National and State citizen and education interest groups.

All the interviews were open-ended and informal but nearly all were built around interview schedules, where are available in the IRE office in Boston. The five questions that provided the framework for the development of the interview schedules were: Who is participating (seeking influence or power)? How are citizens organizing to participate? What are the issues in which they are participating? What impact (results) does the participation have? What are the effects of local, State and Federal government policies and actions?

2. A comprehensive computer search for relevant literature was undertaken and included these data bases: Education Resources Information Center, Social Sciences Citation Index, Sociology Abstracts, and the Foundation Center Data Bank. In addition, searches were made in conventional literature such as the dissertation abstracts and periodical and book indices. More than 500 books, articles, reports, and dissertations were reviewed and summarized; annotations were prepared for most of these.

3. The conventional sources of data for Federal and State court cases were reviewed extensively, including the State and regional reporting system, the Federal Supplement (F. SUPP.), Federal Reporter Second (F. 2nd), States Law Week (U.S.L.W.), and Poverty Law Reporter.

4. A request for information and opinions was mailed to approximately 15,000 readers of the IRE quarterly publication, Citizen Action in Education. Approximately 700 responses were received. Respondents sent us about 400 documents, reports, reprints, and supplementary materials relevant to citizen participation.

5. The Education Commission of the States prepared and disseminated a request for information from each state to locate relevant State laws, regulations, guidelines, and court cases.

6. Since August 1976, we have continuously scanned several sources of relevant current news and information: Education Daily, Education USA, Compact, and Legislative Reports (of the Education Commission of the States), and a variety of organization newsletters.

7. Numerous telephone interviews have been conducted to locate specific information or to verify the accuracy of data or impressions. Staff and consultants have, in a few instances, engaged in follow-up field visits when new data was presented.

8. We have drawn on and referenced several previous major studies and evaluations relevant to citizen participation. Each of these is noted and listed in references at the close of each chapter.

9. We have drawn on several previous concurrent IRE projects and studies. These include: a) a field survey in Florida for the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature on school-based management, the educational finance program, and school advisory committees, b) a continuing project funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation focused on school councils which includes observation and field survey data in several communities across the country with school councils, and c) a study and project on citizen participation in collective bargaining activities in California and New York City.

Documentation from the interviews and field studies are provided when appropriate, along with theory and research results from the literature. But the report is of a special genre: partly scholarly in style and intent, partly popular; partly theoretical, partly practical. Some sections are based on very solid data gathered in our own interviews, from the results of other studies, and from analysis of documents. Other sections are speculative, based on impressions and insights into ideas and trends. The report is addressed to a wide variety of audiences--researchers, decisionmakers, educators, and leaders and members of citizen organizations. The first person plural pronoun is used throughout this interpretative essay because the principal author draws on the ideas and work of other members of the staff of the 33-month study of citizen organizations.

A Preview of Major Impressions

Our report finds that citizen participation in education is widespread. Yet, with some notable exceptions, such participation has not resulted in practice in any substantial shift in power relations among school boards, administrators, and citizens. There is great professional reluctance to accept parents and taxpayers as partners in policymaking. School boards stand firm in their conviction that as elected or appointed officials they represent the public interest in policymaking. On the other hand, more than ever before, schools are receptive to participation by parents and citizens when it supports schools or provides supplementary resources for school programs in non-controversial ways.

Much of this is due to public policy, especially Federal government initiatives of the 1960's. A strong challenge to both local and professional autonomy comes from the Federal Government. Federal education programs--even though they provide on the average less than eight percent of the cost of running local schools--increasingly shape policies and practices.

The Congress and HEW have embraced the concept of citizen participation and included mandates for consultative and advisory mechanisms in nearly all bills and regulations since the early 1970's. Today, an impressive variety of forms of participation, individual and collective, can be found in public school districts. Among ten common types of citizen organizations, the mandated advisory committee predominates, with an estimated 1,250,000 members of more than 100,000 committees.

The States are beginning to follow the Federal lead, but they are moving beyond it to tie participation at the building level to State school finance reform, accountability, and school site management. This new web of mandated and government-initiated participatory mechanisms has promise but clearly these work less effectively than they should. They contribute to what U.S. Representative Barbara Jordan has called "a network of illusions." If participation is a sham, it may increase rather than reduce citizen alienation and frustration. The letter, not the spirit of participation, often prevails and little is done to make the new mechanisms work well.

Through desegregation rulings, the courts have had a strong impact on citizen participation. Desegregation planning has unmasked educational inadequacies, forced curriculum and personnel reform, and given sanction to citizen participation. In the desegregation issue the courts fill a vacuum created by the inadequacy of political and educational leadership at all levels and they draw heavily on citizen groups to help bridge this gap. Desegregation has unquestionably given citizens their most widespread means for strong participation and influence. Also increasing is the use of litigation and advocacy by citizen groups to change policies and practices. These approaches seem to get faster and more frequent results than other ways of influencing decisionmakers.

The community control idea as it re-emerged in the 1960's as part

of the Civil Rights movement represented a serious ideological and political challenge to the status quo of school politics. Racial and ethnic groups sought greater control of the schools as a way to achieve more educational, social, and economic equality. The challenge was diverted in many places. The political response was often some form of decentralization as in New York City, Detroit and Los Angeles. Such decentralizations fell far short of any broad and genuine shift in decisionmaking or any authentic power sharing.

Issues are complicated by the separate efforts of organized teachers to advance their own civic, political, and economic rights. After years of impotence, teachers' associations have developed power, and through collective bargaining they exercise great influence in more areas of educational policy. Collective bargaining and the strength of teacher associations appear to weaken opportunities for citizens to influence policy and decisionmaking, and create antagonism between teachers on one side and the taxpayer-parents on the other. The once strong parent-teacher alliance seems to have deteriorated in many places, but there is growing interest in rebuilding it.

The response of the educational establishment to this upsurge in citizen participation has been typical--cautious and sometimes resistant. Despite the impressive statistics, transfers of power to parents and citizens seem minimal. Professional domination continues: school superintendents dominate school boards; both resist devolving power to parents and citizens.

There are signs that administrators and teachers are beginning to accept the general principle of citizen participation; however, they clearly want manageable, controllable, polite, constructive and upbeat involvement. They accept "input" by citizens, as long as present power relationships remain in place. Some citizens--especially middle-class people--are willing to accept involvement on these terms but many others find such forms of participation unacceptable. These people, including many of the urban poor, often turn their interests and energies to other matters rather than acquiesce to the manipulative and token arrangements in schools.

A comparison of the sixties with the seventies reveals how citizen participation has been tamed. The issues in the 1970's are much the same as those of the 1960's, but the styles of participation have changed somewhat. Working-class people are moving in less militant ways, often through mandated groups. The spirit is often technical and pragmatic, not explicitly ideological. The style has clearly been influenced by the examples and preferences of professional educators.

The goals of most participants seem to be to change some aspects of policy, rather than to grapple with deep issues. Participants are diverse, challenging the elitist premises on which much educational policy is based. Poor and working-class people, black and white, continue to endure poor schools. They share a common burden. Yet poor and working-class people, white and minority, often suspect one group or another of receiving favored treatment from policymakers at the expense of other

disadvantaged groups. Common to all these low-income groups in most cities is a determination that schools should effectively teach the basic skills which students will need to compete successfully in the job market.

There is substantial overall evidence that citizen participation contributes directly to improved school policies, better delivery of educational services, student performance, and individual feelings of social integration and self-worth.

But confusions and contradictions abound in the patterns of participation. These are explained, in part, by the historical and cultural determinants of these patterns and the social contradictions that are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION

HISTORICAL DETERMINANTS: THE OLD AND THE NEW REFORMS

America's public schools have from their beginning been caught in the crossfire of contending political, economic, and cultural forces. Educational history is richly veined with examples of such continuing political struggles as: populism vs. elitism, equality vs. meritocracy, individual vs. group rights, natives vs. newcomers, pluralism vs. homogeneity, church vs. state, innovation and social change vs. stability, and centralization and decentralization of public decisionmaking. Some historical cycles can be traced as these issues are fought, temporarily resolved, redefined, and fought again. The locale for these struggles has nearly always stretched from the local school to the municipality and the state, and on to Washington. The systemic intertwining of local, state, and national forces, while more intense and obvious now, was always a characteristic of educational politics.

The topic of interest in this report--citizen participation in educational decisionmaking--can only be understood in the context of the past and present of school politics. The question of who controls the public schools (which individuals and groups at which levels) has been significant for the past two centuries for multiple ideological, political, and economic reasons; this is largely because public schools are the largest, most widely dispersed, and most costly public enterprise.

School decisions affect the well-being and development of children, an enormously important consideration to most parents and educators. But schools also provide jobs for clerks, teachers, custodians, school doctors, managers, gardeners, and cooks. They mean profits which accrue from selling property; constructing buildings; selling supplies, equipment, insurance, transportation, and services. They mean political visibility and advancement for educators and school board members. Curriculum decisions have an important ideological and cultural content, e.g., bilingualism, ethnic history, vocational training. These decisions affect which social values and which group's history and culture will be legitimated and stressed, which will be discouraged and repressed. Nearly all policy decisions about schools affect economic and social matters and hence are profoundly political.

Patterns of participation in the 1960's and 1970's can best be described in the context of a full scale-social and political history of American public schooling. But, although such a full background is obviously beyond the scope of this study*, some historical perspective is necessary as prologue to describing the upsurge of participation in the 1960's. If nothing else it challenges the myth that schools only recently have become "politicized," and that the idea of "community control" was invented in New York in the early 1960's.

The Old Reform

The Village Community School

During most of the nineteenth century, the rural and small town school belonged to the community in more than a legal sense: it was frequently the focus for people's lives outside the home. 1/ Most nineteenth century public schools were controlled in nearly all their aspects by the community, or at least by free, white males. This "common school both reflected and shaped a sense of community." 2/

During the same period, city schools were often really village schools in urban settings, reflecting great diversity and parochialism. Conflict over control began when industrialization brought serious social problems and millions of European immigrants to the cities.

Industrialization and the School Reform Movement

The last half of the nineteenth century saw a nationwide and persistent effort to reform both urban and rural schools. Consolidation, modern management techniques, uniform curriculum and textbooks, standardized tests, compulsory attendance for longer periods of time, and efficiency became watchwords of the reformers. For businessmen and politicians, schools produced the "human capital" for increased industrialization and economic development. For others, well-managed schools were instruments for creating social stability, preventing disorder and racial-ethnic conflict, for Americanizing immigrant children and, through them, their families. For still others, the central motivation

---

* We recommend that readers who may want and need more background read the following:

David B. Tyack, The One Best System, A History of American Urban Education, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1971).

Colin Greer, The Great School Legend (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

Diane Ravitch, The Great School Wars (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

lay in making the educational lives of children less harsh and more humane, and in instilling the values of mainstream white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant society (piety, cleanliness, initiative, sobriety, fairness, America's rags-to-riches dream, respect for others). Many of this latter group were responding to deplorable conditions in urban schools, many of which were overcrowded, unsanitary, unsafe.

For black children there was no schooling at all in the slave states until after the Civil War. Northern cities were slow to provide even minimal schooling for blacks, and even then it was usually offered in separate schools. For example, black parents in Boston petitioned unsuccessfully in 1797, 1798, and 1800 for schools for their children. By 1830, separate black schools were functioning. Repeated but unsuccessful efforts were made for nearly a century and a half to abolish Boston's segregated system. 3/

The last half of the nineteenth century was marked by rapid economic development and expansion of the public educational system. In 1850 the United States lagged behind the major European powers in industrial output. By 1894 it led the world in production and at the same time had surpassed all other nations in industrial output. 4/

During this period the cities grew rapidly, and specialized impersonal agencies developed to perform functions formerly handled by family, neighbors, private charity (or not at all): departments for fire fighting, garbage collection and street maintenance, street lighting, protection against crime, and health services. Schools were part of this; the creation of an efficient police force paralleled the movement to standardized schooling and both were in response to the influx of the immigrant poor. 5/

Community Control Conflicts in the Nineteenth Century

In city after city during the last half of the century, the move toward standardization and the control of the Yankee middle class and elite was challenged by the new immigrant groups. As they grew in numbers and voting strength, developed effective political leadership, and assumed major roles in and sometimes control of political parties, they resisted the WASP-led drive toward standardization and efficiency in the schools. They saw the WASP's culturally neutral homogeneous schooling as deeply prejudiced against the newcomers who were usually Catholic.

The case of the Irish Catholics in New York in the 1840's is a useful example of the recurring conflicts between pluralism-homogeneity, nativist-newcomer, and centralization-decentralization. In the 1840's the Protestant Public School Society controlled the public schools and saw themselves and the schools as unbiased, fair, and undogmatic. The minority culture--at this time, the Irish Catholics--saw the schools as either ignoring or actively undermining its deepest values. Led by Bishop Hughes, the Irish newcomers challenged the books used and alleged insensitivity of the teachers, in a way parallel to similar challenges of New York's black community in the 1960's. And, again parallel to the

experience of the late 1960's, the battle was fought and partially resolved in the State legislature. The New York legislature in 1842 adopted a law under which...

> Each ward in New York was for educational purposes treated as a separate town. Its schools were controlled by five elected trustees, and the monies it received from the state were given in proportion to the children it served. Pressed to the point of no return, Bishop Hughes and the Irish Catholic Community had politicized the question of local school control and won a victory. 6/

Following this lead, the immigrant groups in many other cities grew in political strength and created school systems that were responsive to their values and interests as newcomers. Urban history in the latter half of the nineteenth century and first two decades of the twentieth century was characterized by graft and corruption; this point has been greatly stressed while the positive fact that political and social institutions were subject to direct control by their diverse constituents has been often ignored.

Adoption of a Political Strategy

Political strength and educational reform began to go hand in hand. Toward the end of the century, the municipal and educational reformers saw that their efforts to "reform the schools" could succeed only if they were able to take political control of them. Their strategy then shifted from efforts to improve curriculum and pedagogy to efforts to reform the structure of school governance. It is interesting to note that this shift in strategy from technical to political reform is almost directly parallel to the shift by leaders of the black community in New York and other cities in the mid and late 1960's from school desegregation and curriculum improvement to community control. In both centuries, ethnic (or racial or religious) differences were keys to the struggle. In both cases class differences based on economic analysis and considerations may have been at least as important as cultural and educational considerations. 7/

In nearly every city in the North, Middlewest, and West, the objectives of political reform were similar: to reduce the size of the school board; to elect school board members districtwide rather than by ward (or in some cases have members appointed by judges); to centralize decisionmaking in a district office; to replace electing the superintendent with selection by the school board; to give the superintendent increased authority; and to give school districts fiscal autonomy from municipal governments. In nearly all cases the reform of school politics paralleled the reform of municipal government; the reformers were generally from WASP, middle-class and elite academic, professional, and business groups. Tyack describes the urban school reformers of this period as "administrative progressives," with a social perspective that tended to be "cosmopolitan yet paternalistic, self-consciously 'modern' in its deference to the expert and its quest for rational efficiency yet

at times evangelical in its rhetorical tone." 8/

The Movement Succeeds

The administrative progressives were notably successful. While details of reform plans and the political struggle varied from region to region and city to city, there was clearly a national movement at work and the contours of the results were similar.

In nearly all cases state leadership--governors and legislators, presidents of state universities or prestigious private colleges--were heavily involved. National leadership and forces were also visibly present. The U.S. Commissioner of Education, although lacking money and direct authority, typically served as spokesperson for the "administrative progressives." 9/ Similarly, the nation's most influential professional associations, including the National Education Association, lent powerful support to the "administrative progressive" movement. 10/ The intertwining of local, state and national forces was as important a part of the patterns of educational decisionmaking in the nineteenth and early twentieth century as it is now.

The Legacy of the Old Reform

Urban school districts became highly centralized, patterned generally on the emerging and highly admired corporate bureaucratic model. The reform movement removed the public schools from the control of ward politicians and laypersons. The composition and role of the school board changed:

> 'Apolitical' school boards, 'reformed' at-large and non-partisan school board elections led to the school boards' isolation from the community and domination of policymaking by professionals [superintendents]. 11/

Increasing reliance on educational experts became the operating policy of the schools. Superintendents changed from clerks to dominant policymakers. The new boards acquiesced to the influence of the superintendent as he or she delegated authority to a rapidly expanding corps of middle-management administrators. The result was a large and powerful centralized school bureaucracy. The public's role was explicitly defined as voting for school board members who usually ran on a citywide, non-partisan basis with candidate recruitment dominated by good-government, civic elite groups. The dominant new pattern of school governance largely determined patterns of participation from the early part of the century into the 1960's.

This brief summary implies a consistency and neatness that was never fully realized in practice. For example, there was a strong citizen movement from the political right in the late 1940's and early 1950's--the McCarthyism and Red Scare era--that had considerable influence on school policies and practices. In addition, financial needs of the schools were greatly increased by the post-war baby boom. A nation-

al citizens' movement developed to build financial support for public schools and to pressure the national government for Federal financial assistance. 12/ This movement resulted in a profusion of local, State and National citizen organizations related to the schools during this period. These groups were typically closely tied to and supportive of the "administrative progressive" organizations and the individuals and groups in control of most urban school systems.

Racist Policies

During the late 1940's and early 1950's overtly racist policies of local and State public school systems were challenged more assertively by organizations such as the NAACP. Scattered and sporadic local efforts in most cities by black parents and citizens to deal with serious inequities of educational services formed a part of the growing Civil Rights movement that was legitimated nationally by the Supreme Court's Brown decision in 1954.

Superintendents Dominate

The success of the "administrative progressive" effort to control schools set the primary patterns of participation until the late 1960's. The superintendents were dominant. This is indicated by Zeigler's finding that over half the school board members could not remember any instance in which their board disagreed with the superintendent over the content of an educational program. Only 38 percent could cite any instances of firm disagreement. 13/

> In all but a handful of districts the superintendents participated in determining the board's agenda. In 66 percent of the districts the superintendent had sole responsibility for agenda setting. 14/

Apparently, superintendents tended to outlast board members; at least in Zeigler's sample the average tenure of superintendents was 8.2 years; of board members, 5.1 years. 15/

A recent opinion survey by the Gallup Organization for the NSBA adds some surprising twists to the issue of school board-superintendent authority. 16/ The survey found that, among the public, most people who profess to know anything about the operations and government of their local schools believe that final policymaking authority should be vested in the school administration. Two areas of management were excepted, however: the hiring of principals and of superintendents. School boards, the survey found, were expected by a majority of those surveyed to retain these responsibilities.

During the survey it was learned that only half the public appears to know that there is any difference between "school boards" and "school administrations." Only 58 percent of the poll's respondents knew that the school board "has the responsibility for running public schools." Of the respondents, 40 percent believed that the PTAs run the schools;

30 percent see administrators and 18 percent the teachers' unions as having this responsibility; 63 percent could not identify one thing the local board had done during the past year; and 53 percent could not guess the size of their local board. The level of ignorance about school boards, which together constitute the largest number of legislative political organs in the country, is startling. But this condition can be seen as one legacy of the "administrative progressives."

Lack of Board Member Representativeness

The dramatic reduction in the number of school districts in the United States--from 84,000 in 1950 to about 16,000 in 1976--has greatly reduced the number of school board members. 17/ The composition of school boards is: approximately 88.1 percent male, 11.9 percent female 18/; 96 percent white, 4 percent minority; 66 percent business-professional status, 34 percent all other. 19/ The figures dramatize other evidence that school board membership is far from being demographically representative.

The Zeigler study revealed other relevant data about the composition and representativeness of school boards:

- 11 percent of school boards are appointed; 21 percent of all members (including members of elected boards) originally gained their seats by appointment. 20/
- About 33 percent of all board members were nominated or sponsored for election or appointment by incumbent board members. Zeigler concludes: "There exists an educational elite which is constantly self-perpetuating." 21/
- Incumbents are usually reelected to office (in 50 percent of the districts, 89-100 percent of the incumbents were reelected). 22/
- Large urban districts have more competitive school board elections than smaller districts. 23/
- 53 percent of the members have a business or civic leadership background, followed by experience in PTA (42 percent) and citizen advisory committees (32 percent). School-based citizen participation mechanisms are stepping stones or training grounds for board membership.
- Educational careers are much in evidence among board members: 21 percent hold or have held jobs in education; of these, 25 percent were currently employed in education. 24/

Only about 36 percent of all adults consider school boards either "excellent" or "good" as "representative of the public;" however, 50 percent of parents of public school children found them either "excellent"

or "good." A small percentage of people in the large cities feel their boards are representative (32 percent in cities with a million residents; 24 percent in cities from 250,000 to 999,999 persons). 25/

Lack of School Board Responsiveness

Only a minority of people believe that "their school board will respond to them by listening to an appeal to reconsider a decision." Of the respondents in a recent survey, 41 percent say it is fairly likely, 10 percent say it is very likely, that the boards would listen. Confidence that the board would listen is dramatically lower in cities with populations of 250,000 and higher where about 6 to 20 percent believe that is is "very likely or fairly likely" that the board would consider the appeal of a decision. 26/

The Zeigler findings provide a similar picture of unresponsiveness. School board members were asked if they could recall any instances when community groups ever tried to have parents change parts of the education program. Of those questioned, 37 percent answered, "yes." Board members who were more actively opposed to their respective superintendents also expressed a more favorable orientation toward interest groups in general, and toward militant teacher groups and taxpayer groups. 27/ The groups most commonly mentioned by school board members as influential were PTA groups, teacher unions, and "left-wing" civil rights/civil liberties groups. However, depending on the issue, groups exercised substantially different degrees of influence. 28/

The Depoliticising of the Schools

There is additional evidence of the success of the reform movement. Although citizens elect school board members on a municipal ballot, few consider public education a "political" issue. Citizen participation in education at the local level, even measured by voting, has been extremely low. Until the late 1950's, political scientists simply omitted study of schools, reasoning that they were not generally regarded as political entities.

On the basis of data from interviews with 490 school board members in 82 local school districts across the nation, Zeigler and his collaborators conclude that:

- In unreformed, "political" school districts (i.e., districts with partisan and ward or district elections), school boards are less likely to be dominated by professionals.

- In unreformed districts, school board members more often face contested elections, have prior political experience, are more representative of and responsive to the community, and more independent of professional domination.

Interestingly, Zeigler concludes by recommending that "...to increase citizen participation and influence, politics should be put back into the governing of schools through means such as district elections,

decentralization, and community control." 29/

The Consensus of Values

One of the most important legacies of the reform movement was a middle-class consensus on values which sustained school administrators and school boards in their policies and practices. The public assumed that most educational decisions required technical expertise and should best be delegated to professionals. Issues such as school governance, the budget, personnel, curriculum, pupil testing, and discipline usually were considered outside the sphere of citizen participation.

THE NEW REFORM: THE ACTIVISM OF THE 1960's

Despite the success of the "administrative progressives," a new reform began to emerge to challenge and erode that consensus on middle-class values. One important cause for this erosion lay in demographic change in the cities. World War II and the postwar period saw important changes--continued migration of blacks and accelerated migration of Spanish background people to urban centers, the rapid growth of nearly all-white suburbs; public housing policies which greatly increased segregation by race and socioeconomic class, and the new migrant streams caused by the amendments to the Federal Immigration Act of 1965.

In addition, the Civil Rights movement and high levels of economic growth and national affluence fueled rising expectations on the part of the poor for both economic and social benefits.

Rising expectations were also encouraged by events in the early years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, and the consequent disillusionment led to the alienation, turmoil, and riots in the cities in the 1960's. One response of the Federal government was the War on Poverty, which instituted new aid programs requiring target group representation in planning and execution.

New Participants

Thus, new people--mostly the urban poor, many of whom were black or other minorities--began participating, often teaming with liberal white middle class advocates of social change. These new participants soon turned to the problems of education. Conditions in city schools were typically deplorable. The schools were largely run and staffed by the white middle class (with different ethnic groups dominant in different cities), while the minority pupil population grew steadily in size and pupil performance deteriorated.

The new participants and their liberal allies challenged the dominant view of the cause of failures of urban schools which put most of the blame on the student and his/her home rather than on the school. Scholastic underachievement of minorities and poor persons became a political issue. Revisionist historians argued that schools traditionally

functioned as white, middle-class institutions, socializing pupils to accept the values which supported the existing system of social stratification and allocation of wealth. They viewed the schools as part of the pervasive system of social control, with school personnel making decisions which vitally affected individuals' life choices and opportunities.

A growing challenge to the predominant view of the social function of schools emerged. As the existing class structure grew controversial in the 1960's, so did the values and the educational structure which maintained it. Persons demanding community control and other new forms of citizen participation brought into the open new, volatile concerns for areas of institutional activity previously considered professional and technical and therefore not subject to political, partisan, or public influence.

They insisted that the proper function of schools was broader than simply developing students' academic ability. Attention also needed to be focused on the affective education of pupils, especially as it concerned their racial and ethnic group identities. Furthermore, schools were expected to serve as the institutional foundations for building community solidarity and transforming the outlook and participatory behavior of community residents. Schools would help the community to mobilize its political power for economic, political, and social advance.

New Issues, New Approaches to Reform

Consequently, the old legitimacy of the system broke down. The ability and willingness of schools and professionals to serve the children of the poor effectively were attacked, not only at the local level, but in Washington, in the universities, and in the foundations supporting reform projects. All of this ushered in an era of challenges to established patterns of authority in school governance. Such challenges took the form of boycotts, mass rallies, sit-ins, marches, and other direct and militant confrontations with decisionmakers.

Casting the reform issue in such openly political terms changed the nature of the debate on school change. Areas of "professional decision-making"--curriculum design and personnel--were to come under the purview of laypersons. Decisions about the kinds of curricula and staff needed for schools were to be made by laypersons with consideration for a political vision of a new future the students would help to build and eventually participate in.

The new issues in which some minority community people demanded to participate cut through details of bureaucratic shuffling and into the purposes and philosophy of schooling. The questions asked included: What should schools teach? Who should teach? Who should choose teachers and on what basis? How should money for schools be spent?

Educational reform, which had been an essentially technical issue aimed at improved management of schools or delivery of services, lost

center stage to issues calling for political and economic reform. The rationale for decentralizing schools and opening them to community control held that changes in power relations between professionals and clients within the system of school governance were necessary prerequisites to significant educational change. No real changes in classrooms could ever develop without changes of the persons controlling schools. As a result, the community control movement emerged as a major challenge to professional hegemony of the schools.

"New Reform": The Movement for Community Control of Schools

New immigrant groups in the cities in the nineteenth century saw the public schools as instruments for civil rights, for economic, social, and political advancement, for cultural preservation, for protection against injustice. The schools as instruments for civil rights was equally central to the community control efforts by urban blacks during the past decade and to the parallel movement by Native Americans, and by Chicanos in the Southwest. Community control of schools in the nineteenth century as well as in the 1960's and 1970's was seen as a way to advance the rights and protect the interests of specific groups and classes of people, not simply individuals or coincidental collections of aggrieved individuals. Claims for equal protection under the law and for due process when applied to classes of minority people are far more controversial and threatening than when such claims are defined in individual terms, e.g., the right of an individual to free speech. This explains, in part, the level of controversy engendered in New York City.

Two Forms of Community Control: Public and Private

Across the country, the movement took two structural forms. The first was to gain control, usually meaning a major degree of autonomy, over a public school (as in the Morgan School in Washington, D.C.); a cluster of schools or subdistricts in a public system (as in the experimental school districts in New York City, e.g., I.S. 201); or an entire school district (as in Crystal City, Texas). The second form was to create or to gain control over an independent, private school (as with Harlem Prep), street academies or parent cooperatives in many cities. In the latter type, there was sometimes an accompanying effort to obtain public funding for the independent school.

The first type is predictably more controversial and threatening to public school officials as it means that a portion of a public school system is formally delegated substantial autonomy in matters of budget, personnel, and program, with policymaking and decisionmaking authority delegated by a central board of education to a board composed of parents and community residents. As Philip Meranto points out, it "involves a fundamental redistribution of power." 30/

This kind of community control was most fully developed in New York with the establishment of three experimental, community-controlled school districts--I.S. 201, Ocean Hill-Brownsville, and Two Bridges. These experiments, financially backed by the Ford Foundation, produced extraor-

dinary conflict and controversy, and triggered the New York teachers' strike of 1968. The demonstration districts were abandoned after less than three years with the passage of the New York City School Decentralization Act at the State level.

The community control experiments and controversy in New York had a nationwide impact. They were widely reported in both the popular and academic media. People were led to believe that the community control experiment in New York had failed. The evidence to support such a claim, of course, is not conclusive. It is mixed and contradictory. But few would argue that there was sufficient time or nurture to provide a fair test of an important idea.

The New York move for community control began as a reaction to the failure of the city school board to desegregate the schools. Because it was tied in to the Civil Rights movement, the concept spread to Washington, Milwaukee, Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles, Buffalo, Hartford, and other cities. It encompassed other minority groups. The movement grew from the assertion that black and other minority children would always fail if they were in institutions where the main players, rulemakers, scorekeepers, and judges were those white middle-class and elite persons who, at present, had all the power.

Chicano communities in Texas, Los Angeles and other parts of the Southwest embraced the idea, emphasizing political and community economic development and preservation of their language and cultural identity. 31/ Native Americans sought to break away from the bureaucratic control of the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs. 32/ Efforts to establish Indian controlled school boards (both BIA-controlled and local public schools) stressed rooting schooling in native tradition and language, giving Indian tribes the political control of schools, and breaking years of domination by white professionals and government officials over Indian education.

In other places, including some small towns and cities, the community control movement spawned the development of many small parent cooperatives and other community-based community schools outside the public system. Racial and ethnic pride, and the desire for both equality of opportunity and autonomy in decisionmaking about the purposes and content of education were important motivations. The community control movement had a number of positive results. For example, more urban schools have made an attempt to increase their recruitment of minority group teachers and administrators and new participatory structures were created, e.g., advisory councils. The use of paraprofessionals drawn from the ranks of ghetto parents grew, and teachers' organizations moved to cover them in collective-bargaining agreements, e.g., in Washington, D.C. Indeed, I.S. 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville may have served as national catalysts for greater parent citizen participation in educational decisionmaking.

The major response to the community control idea was administrative decentralization. Specifically, decentralization was the legislative

reaction to the community control conflict in both New York City and Detroit. These cities were and remain the only examples of political decentralization, where some power devolved to community school boards and where participation by parents and other citizens is built into the plan. In most other large cities, administrative decentralization was adopted primarily to forestall pressure for community control. In some cities, as in Chicago, Los Angeles, and Miami, advisory school site and/or subdistrict advisory councils were set up along with the decentralization plan. Administrative decentralization has not usually distributed power in any meaningful sense, and has not necessarily led to increased citizen participation.

Moreover, the forces for centralized decisionmaking are still strong. Recentralization is occurring because of citywide collective bargaining, the bureaucratic needs of Federal programs such as Title I, and court-ordered desegregation plans (except in Boston where the plan was designed specifically to create decentralized decisionmaking). Decentralization, at one point challenging enough to elicit substantial professional and citizen participation, has grown weaker over time. The groups that have been traditionally opposed to decentralization remain so--teachers' unions, administrator organizations, central school boards elected or appointed at large, some of the traditional reform organizations such as PTA's and many business and corporation interests.

Reversing the strong trend toward decentralization seems, paradoxically, to be possible only through State and Federal intervention. Federal and State funding policies and requirements for citizen influence conceivably could converge to support the incipient school-based management concept, which has within it elements of both decentralization and community control.

School-Based Management

In the late 1970's, a new form of decentralization is being proposed: school-based management. Except for Florida and California, there is certainly no trend toward school-based management. At this point the idea is still theoretical rather than operational but it may begin to attract increasing attention among state legislators, legislative staff members, department of education officials and among local organizations. For example, the kinship between this idea and the decentralization of municipal planning and services may be recognized by local planners and citizen organizations; foundations and researchers have become interested in the idea.

The concept itself is simple and has two parts: delegating some important decisionmaking authority (e.g., budget, personnel, curriculum) to the local school building or site level and implementation of a collaborative and participatory mechanism for planning, policymaking and evaluation at the school site (through a school site council).

This concept has been thoughtfully developed by a research team including Lawrence Pierce, Walter Garms, James W. Guthrie, and Michael W. Kirst, in a report on school finance alternatives in Oregon. This group

recognizes that the school site is the most appropriate and manageable unit for school decisionmaking and problem solving by contending that the district is too large and the classroom too small.

> The important contact between educator and client takes place not at the district level, but at the school site. It is the teacher and principal, rather than central office personnel, who appear to be in the best position to make judgements about programs for students. It is to the local school that parents accord their greatest allegiance. 33/

This research team also recommends a parent advisory committee at each site. But what is most striking about their proposal is the linkage between these ideas and four other state reform proposals. First is the concept of school site budgeting--lump sum allocations to individual schools based on formal districtwide rules. Second is the proposal to increase the authority of the principal (and, by implication at least, the training and competence of the principal). Third is a statewide system of criterion-referenced testing to provide direct accountability to the public on results in terms of measurable student performance. And fourth is the idea of "Annual Performance Reports," to be carried out by the parent advisory committee, the principal, and the students, and made public through newspapers.

As pointed out in a separate report, several states have moved toward this combination of accountability and school governance.* A recent study in Florida shows that this State has translated some concepts into action--local advisory councils, annual performance reports, incentives for school site budgeting--but full-scale implementation has been slow. 34/

The school-based management concept has serious flaws unless it encompasses both citizen participation in a strong and meaningful sense and a strong system of reporting and accountability from the building level. Diffused and unaccountable power can make it difficult to assure school district adherence to State or Federal constitutional or legislative requirements and can further entrench professional control of decisionmaking.

It is far too early to assess the results of the first two decades of the "new reform," which, through aggressive social action and citizen initiative community control, sought decentralization of decisionmaking, and an enlarged citizen voice in school decisionmaking. However, we attempt a beginning assessment of these results in Chapter IV.

Both the old and the new reforms have to be seen as a part of the overall social contradictions that have characterized our nation almost

---

* Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools, Chapter 2. (Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education, 1978).

from the beginning, and which now are so profoundly affecting the patterns of participation with which we deal in this report

CULTURAL CONTRADICTIONS

The American nation was born out of the eighteenth-century enlightenment. From its very beginnings and true to its Enlightenment origins, American society has placed a great value, and hence a corresponding burdent, on its schools as vehicles for individual and group progress. It is not surprising that the history of school governance and school reforms efforts are inherently political. "Schooling" cannot be viewed as a merely technical, neutral delivery of a social service without larger implications. These implications involve the role of schools as vehicles for social mobility in a stratified society and as symbols of local community identity in a culturally pluralistic society.

While school politics, except for busing controversies, are not as volatile in the 1970's as they were in the 1960's, this does not mean that all value questions have been resolved. In fact, the busing controversy is instructive in that it highlights the number of perennial, unresolved conflicts which continue to form the cultural context of schooling and citizen participation in educational decisionmaking.

Desegregation Threatens Existing Life Patterns

The furor associated with citizens' reactions to school desegregation is consistent with the depth of its challenge to the status quo. Not only has it unmasked inequities based on racial differences, but it has also laid bare a range of contradictions which exist at various levels of American society as a whole 35/ Politically, economically and socially, desegregation cuts across usually distinct lines and threatens people's existing life patterns.

At the political level, for example, desegregation highlights the problems inherent in a culture which, for centuries, has emphasized the individual. The legacy of rugged individualism, which runs through American history as a steady theme from the Daniel Boone type of frontiersman to Teddy Roosevelt's cavalry style and is now embedded in constitutional guarantees and legal canon, has two major effects today: on the one hand, it legitimates majority demands for individual rights and private good, while on the other hand, it blocks recognition of minority demands for group rights justified by conceptions of the public good. 36/

Economically, desegregation also throws into relief long-lasting inequities in the distribution of national wealth and gross income which have become firmly fixed through this century. Existing income distribution coupled with a slow-growth economy means that economic progress on the part of minorities threatens those in adjacent income brackets. The inevitable hostilities between white and minority persons competing for

the same "share of the pie" are further intensified by the concentration of low-income populations in older industrial cities, and the safe position of the more affluent in suburbs untouched by desegregation. The result is that the "costs" of desegregation are unevenly distributed among economic classes. Traditional analysis of and remedies for urban conflicts generated by desegregation have, so far, failed to confront the more pervasive fact of socio-economic segregation.

Beyond this, at the cultural level, whether in urban localities or in the suburbs, desegregation exposes and challenges cherished beliefs about schools and communities. Desegregation places upon the public schools the burden of serving all students equally well--a task that can be viewed as an historical first.

Traditional Idea of Neighborhood Endangered

Considerable evidence has shown that, from the beginning, public schools have not adequately met the needs of many children from poor and working class homes--both black and white. 37/ Despite this evidence, many white working-class parents continue to maintain their faith in neighborhood-based public schooling as the primary guarantee of future opportunity. Interracial schooling for their children is perceived by some of these parents as a threatening first step toward eventual and profound change in the community itself. Moreover, racial integration which involves moving children from a familiar location to an unfamiliar one makes people uneasy because it strikes at the heart of a concept deeply woven into the fabric of American life over generations--the idea of "our neighborhood" and "our neighborhood schoolhouse." At least in northern industrial cities, this "urban village" concept has been taken for granted as not only the best way to educate children within a familiar community but also as the traditional basis for family and community life.

These issues, together with unresolved questions about individualism, equality, class, and preservation of "community" against the centrifugal forces of the "melting pot" and of distant authority, are some of the social contradictions that define the cultural context of American schools and frame today's patterns of citizen participation. Because of the American faith in schools as forces for enlightenment and avenues for equality of opportunity, the vital question--Who controls the schools?--gets caught in the crossfire of these contradictions.

Social and Cultural Contradictions

Opposition to school busing is sometimes justified as a defense of "local control" against the dictates of some "distant authority." This kind of justification trades on the wave of contemporary "populism" manifested in the rhetoric of politicians, but more concretely in citizens' lack of confidence in public officials and institutions.

A recent Harris survey shows that only trash collectors and physicians have retained a measure of public respect and confidence. 38/ The

survey also showed that: most people believe that the "quality of their lives" is declining; a majority of survey respondents believe "something is deeply wrong with the country;" distrust in the ability of the government and politicians to solve social problems is prevalent; and, many persons believe that the performance of government and social institutions (among these are schools, postal services, and State legislatures) has declined. The same poll found that: only 21 percent of the American people had confidence in the House of Representatives; 21 percent in the U.S. Senate; 28 percent in the Supreme Court, and 27 percent in the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government.

National School Boards Association Survey

As previously pointed out, a survey conducted by the National School Boards Association found a similar pattern of attitudes regarding school boards. Less than 40 percent of people in both large cities and smaller ones feel their boards are sufficiently representative. 39/ These small percentages may stem from citizens' feelings of powerlessness regarding school boards which they perceive as distant and professionally dominated. The results of NSBA's survey are shown below. They

Table 6.1 Views of survey respondents as to which groups, organizations, or governmental units have most influence with school boards.

Group, organization or governmental unit	Percentage of Groups of Respondents		
	All adults	Parents	Non-Parents
School Administrators	43	50	40
Teachers and teachers' organizations	33	40	30
Parents	30	38	26
Local government	19	19	18
Politically powerful groups	13	14	12
State government	12	12	11
Students	10	12	9
Local political parties	9	8	10

reflect that the size of a community affects the citizens' sense of responsiveness of their school boards only in smaller districts, where administrators are thought to wield more influence than their big-city counterparts. Such lack of confidence or "populist alienation" from institutions of de facto and de jure authority has, as its root cause, the premise that the individual is the source of all value--institutions must be justified in terms of what they can do for individuals.

Schools Viewed as Social Economic Escalator

This individualism disqualified caste-like social distinctions and proclaims equality of opportunity, but at the same time, in the name of free enterprise, it can be used to legitimate caste-like, persistent inequalities in income. The escape hatch has always been education. There is a presumption that schooling is the escalator for socio-economic mobility despite evidence to the contrary. However, when schools "fail" and the nation's income structure remains rigid rather than permeable, schools are to blame. They are accused of being mere instruments, albeit unwitting of "capitalist domination" or more commonly (and perhaps, more plausibly) of failing to teach "basic skills." Despite this, there is a residual faith in the value of schooling as opposed to the performance of schools.

Moreover, this ambivalence goes even deeper. Many citizens internalize schools' poor performance and put the blame on the family.40/

In the Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools, published in Phi Delta Kappan, October 1976, the poll revealed increased feelings of parental responsibility for children's education: 59 percent felt that the decline of academic achievement was attributable to less parental concern. "Less parent attention, concern and supervision of the child" was given as the main reason for a nationwide decline in college test scores.

Schools Face Unresolved Conflicts over Race and Ethnicity

In addition to being viewed as a social economic escalator, schools have always had another cultural mission. At various times in our history schools have alternatively, and often simultaneously, been charged with furthering the "melting-pot" and with preserving and inculcating local "community values," i.e., cultural pluralism. This puts schools in the middle of unresolved conflicts over race and ethnicity.

While the premise of individualism embraces racial equality, it can also argue against State-enforced efforts to redress centuries of discrimination by affirmative action which recognized group claims to distributive justice. Individualism calls for a color blind melting pot but can equally well justify ethnic particularism on the grounds that group identity is the foundation for individual development; thus, the cultural belief in individualism can also legitimate opposition to racial desegregation.

As primary social integrators, instruments of the melting pot, and equality of opportunity, schools find themselves on the front line of racial desegregation with ambivalent leadership from public officials and facing a divided public opinion.* However, as preservers of community values, their status as "neighborhood schools" is protected; thus, given residential patterns of racial segregation, schools tend to remain ethnically and racially homogenous. Finally, to add yet another complexity, black urban community control advocates seek to make their local schools into agents of their people's "community values."

Populism and individualism are not new aspects of the American culture. Americans are not by nature or culture apt to be deferential to ascribed status or to distant authority. As a corollary, our "unwritten constitution" features civic participation as at least a "right" if not a duty. This feature of our political culture had been noted as early as the 1830's by Alexis DeToqueville. It was confirmed more than a century later by Almond and Verba's more systematic five-nation comparative study of citizenship. 41/

By comparison with other countries, we may indeed be a participatory polity. However, according to Lois Saxelby Steinberg in Social Science Theory and Research on Participation and Voluntary Associations: A Bibliographic Essay:

> Operational definitions of participation in most empirical studies are rarely consistent with the conceptual definition specified in the theories of participatory democracy. That is, they do not include or obtain data on the respondents' actual involvement in decisions affecting the policies of the organization. In the most frequently cited surveys, respondents are simply asked how many and what types of organizations they belong to. The one relationship for which the results of most studies are in agreement, regardless of how membership is operationalized, pertains to socio-economic differences. Membership in voluntary associations is distinctly characteristic of middle-and upper-middle-class Americans as measured by occupation, income or education. 42/

With regard to race, the findings are less consistent. One 1953 and 1955 report found membership levels among blacks lower than whites, but by 1962 there was an increase of black membership and decline of white membership, narrowing the difference between the two groups. 43/ This 1955 survey was challenged by a 1960 survey of adult blacks in

---

* Although by the mid-seventies a majority of Americans were supporting school desegregation in principle, recent surveys show that about 75 percent of this population nonetheless oppose busing as the best means to an end. Ira Sharkansky and Donald Van Meter, Policy and Politics in American Government. New York: (McGraw-Hill, 1975.) pp. 24-26.

Nebraska, which showed that three-fourths of the respondents had organizational affiliations. The researchers attributed the difference in findings to the fact that their survey had included membership in religious groups as opposed to the earlier study which had not.

Female Members Predominate in Citizen Organizations

It is also widely shown that more men than women belong to instrumental organizations. This is in part a reflection of male dominance in the professions and industry. Since the studies were all conducted prior to the women's liberation movement, they cannot reflect changes in attitudes and policies attributable to that movement. There is also a relationship between membership and age; organizational membership is more characteristic of older than of younger age groups.

Summary: Civic Competency and Populism

Moreover, the political acumen and civic competence of citizens seems minimal. More people have more formal education than ever before but according to the 1969-1970 Assessment of Citizenship, less than 20 percent of the adult population can identify five ways to influence government.44/ A 1971-1972 study, the Assessment of Political Knowledge and Attitudes, showed that 45 percent of the adult population could not distinguish among the five basic functions of local, State and Federal government. Nor could any identify even two approaches that might alleviate poverty in a neighborhood. 45/

There are similarly low levels of civic competency on issues of school governance as previously noted in our discussion of the National School Boards Association survey. This revealed considerable confusion in the public view of who has the real responsibility for running the schools. 46/

There are many contradictory explanations for these low levels of civic competency and participation; for example, at two extremes, apathy may be seen as either a secure satisfaction with or profound alienation from public institutions. A full discussion of this issue would be beyond the scope of this essay. However, there is an additional feature of American culture which does have a direct bearing on citizen participation in education.

Co-existing with Americans' populist lack of deference to ascribed status is a cultural faith in reason and science due, at least in part, to the nationalist, Enlightenment eighteenth-century origins of our Republic. Furthermore, as befits individualists with a faith in equality of opportunity and careers open to talent there is an undercurrent of deference to persons of achieved status. This is especially potent where such achievement is certified and credentialed on scientific or even "quasiscientific" grounds, i.e., the "expert" or the "professional." As noted in the previous section of this chapter such beliefs justified the early twentieth century Progressive Reform of schools with its attendant centralization and professional domination of school policymaking. Moreover, similar beliefs in science, rationality and expertise have justi-

fied "big" centralized and distant government--the target of contemporary populism.

A final paradox is that "big" government, through Federal initiatives in poverty and compensatory education programs, and increasingly through State legislation, has opened up new avenues for citizen participation in local schools. These Federal and State initiatives are discussed in the next chapter.

These social contradictions have been reflected in the relations between citizens and educators and government officials for 150 years. That the upsurge of citizen participation in the schools in the past 15 years has intensified these conflicts simply demonstrates that the basic contradictions have not been resolved. The contradictions will appear and reappear in the chapters which follow. For example, the paradox of big government being the primary initiator of citizen participation at a time of populist revival can be seen in Chapter II, which describes the powerful impact of government actions on citizen participation since the mid-1960's.

CHAPTER I - REFERENCES

1. David G. Tyack, The One Best System, A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 15-16.

2. Ibid.

3. Carol L. Wolfe, "A Selective History of Boston and the Boston Public School 1635-1976," Unpublished paper, 1977.

4. Tyack, The One Best System, p.25.

5. Ibid., p.32.

6. Nicholaus Mills, "Community Schools; Irish, Italians, and Jews," Society 11, No. 3 (1974), pp. 76-84.

7. Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1971.)

8. Tyack, The One Best System, p. 127.

9. Ibid., p.40.

10. Ibid., p.49.

11. L. Harmon Zeigler and M. Kent Jennings, Governing American Schools (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1974), p. 51.

12. Glenn Jensen, "Better Schools When Public Participates," Phi Delta Kappan 37, No. 2 (1955), pp. 77-83. See also Glenn Jensen, "Review of 1956: Citizens' Groups," School Executive 76 (1957), pp. 70-71.

13. Zeigler and Jennings, Governing American Schools, p. 163.

14. Ibid., p. 190.

15. Ibid., p. 68.

16. Research Report, 1975: The People Look at Their School Boards, National School Boards Association (Evanston, Ill. 1975).

17. Jonathan P. Sher and Rachel B. Tompkins, "Economy, Efficiency, and Equality: The Myth of Rural District Consolidations," Educational Forum (January 1977).

18. Research Report, 1974: Women on School Boards, National School Boards Association (Evanston, Ill., 1974).

19. Zeigler and Jennings, Governing American Schools, p. 28, table 2.1.

20. Ibid., p. 32.

21. Ibid., p. 50.

22. Ibid., p. 39.

23. Ibid., p. 31.

24. Ibid., p. 27.

25. The People Look at Their School Boards, p. 9.

26. Ibid., p. 99.

27. Zeigler and Jennings, p. 214.

28. Ibid., p. 99.

29. Ibid., p. 51.

30. Philip Meranto, School Politics in the Metropolis (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1970), p. 145.

31. Casa de la Raza, Southwest Network, University of Nebraska Printing and Duplicating Services, pp. 31-32.

32. "CISB Urges More Control at Local Levels," Education Journal of Indian Law 1, No. 8, (1973), pp. 7-12.

33. Lawrence L. Pierce, Walter Garms, James W. Guthrie and Michael W. Kirst, State School Finance Alternatives: Strategies for Reform, (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon- Center for Educational Policy and Management, May 1975), p. 101.

34. Improving Education in Florida: A Reassessment, Progress Report for the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature (February, 1978).

35. Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools (Boston, Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, 1978), p. 138.

36. Ibid., p. 133.

37. Ibid., pp. 133-34.

38. See Summary of the Harris Poll in New York Times, 16:2 (December 3, 1973).

39. The People Look at Their School Boards.

40. James Cass, "Love/Hate Story," Saturday Review (March 9, 1978).

41. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Co., 1965).

42. (Boston, Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, 1978), p. 18. See also, C. R. Wright and H. H. Hyman, "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review (June 1958).

43. Nicholas Babchuk and Ralph V. Thompson, "The Voluntary Associations of Negroes," American Sociological Review (October 1962).

44. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Report No. 2: Citizenship-National Results, Education Commission of the States (Washington, D.C.: November 1970).

45. Gerald L. Marriner et al., "Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1971-72," Education Commission of the States (Washington, D.C.: December 1973).

46. The People Look at Their School Boards, Chapter 6, p. 107.

CHAPTER II

FEDERAL AND STATE INFLUENCE

The ambiguity and complexity of power and decisionmaking in a Federal system such as ours places limits on local citizen participation. Local school governance is systemically related to municipal, State and Federal actions. Some basic facts are clear. By omission, the Federal Constitution reserves authority for education to the States. But from the start, the Federal government has had significant impact on both lower and higher education, and that impact has steadily increased over the years. The Federal influence comes from decisions of the Federal courts, from legislation and regulations, funding decisions and administrative actions of many executive agencies. Some of the Federal impact is direct and intended, e.g., the Brown decision of 1954, the Elementary/Secondary Education Act of 1964. But much is indirect as with energy policy which affects the cost of fuel purchased by schools or tax policies which encourage middle-class people to leave the cities for the suburbs.

The States organize to provide public schooling through local education agencies, but they do so in many and complex forms. Most such local agencies are governed by elected public boards and administered by appointed superintendents. State governments (through courts, legislatures and executive agencies) have final authority over most local school affairs, even though there is a long-standing State deference to "local autonomy." Typically, local school districts have some relationship with municipalities and other local agencies. However, these relationships range from complete autonomy to total dependence.

Money to run the schools comes from a wide variety of sources in myriad patterns varying from State to State and often from district to district. In most States, the largest amount of money for school districts comes from local taxes, especially the local property tax. But in nearly all local districts some money (sometimes as much as 60 to 70 percent) comes from State sources and some from a wide variety of Federal programs. Patterns of school finance are continuously under study and challenge, and revised through action of the State courts or legislatures, direct voter action and local tax or bond elections. Proposition 13 in California is a vivid, recent example of direct voter action.

Even these most elementary facts are filled with ambiguities. Few citizens or educators appear to have an adequate grasp of all the com-

plexities which affect the running of schools. Nevertheless, it is clear that neither local citizen participants nor school officials can function effectively unless they have some knowledge of the structures, relationships, and formal and informal modes of decisionmaking that affect their particular school or school system. Neither can patterns of citizen participation be understood without recognizing the powerful roles played by Federal and State governments. Our focus in this chapter is on Federal and State legislation which fosters citizen participation.

THE FEDERAL INFLUENCE

Federal interventions influence every aspect of citizen participation in educational decisionmaking. The influence has been stronger in the past twenty years than in previous times and is continuously growing. It comes from the courts, the Congress, rules and administrative actions of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and other executive agencies. The influence is often direct--mandates for specific forms of citizen participation--and indirect--determining the educational issues about which citizens will be concerned. These influences are discussed in more detail than is possible here in a companion report, Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools. Much of the material in this chapter is drawn from that report.

Decades of Civil Rights Activity

The reaffirmation by the Federal courts of the powerful equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment starting with the Brown decision in 1954 had multiple effects on the schools and on citizen participation. Inequality based on race, language, sex and class in most aspects of American life was highlighted. This stimulated citizen action, litigation, legislation and new regulations. This, in turn, resulted in further Federal pressure to change local school policies in many areas in addition to racial desegregation. Some examples: the protection of students under the First Amendment and due process clause; the rights of students and parents to information; the rights of handicapped, non-English speakers and women to equal access to school services; and, affirmative action in school hiring.

Federal Response to Urban Unrest

Continuing and seemingly insoluble economic inequities and the deterioration of the cities led to the urban unrest of the 1960's and to the Kennedy-Johnson administration responses. Programs such as Urban Renewal, Model Cities, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 were designed to deal with urban unrest. These responses to inner-city demands and upheaval included requirements for target group representation in planning and execution. Many Federal policymakers expected that these efforts would help integrate the bottom segments of the urban population into community life, thus promoting stability.

There is a shared history of intent and similarity of institutional mechanisms between the participatory requirements of the anti-poverty era and similar requirements in the Federal education programs since 1970. The programs of the 1960's were extensively documented and studied.* Some of the general characteristics of citizen participation are especially relevant to patterns of participation in the schools in the 1970's and, hence, are summarized here:

1. Federal provisions for participation of the poor were typically ambiguous and varied in scope and mandate. Legislative language ranged from vague and permissive to highly detailed and mandatory.

2. There was no unitary or coordinated Federal policy aimed at encouraging citizen participation. Wide variations existed among departments and agencies, and in the case of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), within the Department. This fragmentation of purpose and means inevitably had implications for the local administration of Federal poverty programs.

3. Local response to the multiplicity of requirements varied widely, as did program results. Many of the variations in the nature and effectiveness of local programs are attributable to the differing political cultures of the cities.

4. Effective grassroots leadership was identified and developed in the Federal programs of the 1960's.

5. There are reasonable grounds for asserting that the most effective participation occurs within independent, voluntary associations. In many instances, the Federally mandated participatory activities led to the development of voluntary neighborhood organizations and ad hoc groups. In other cases, existing citizen-initiated organizations were enlivened and stimulated by the mandated activities.

Two Federal educational efforts that were contained in the anti-poverty legislation--Head Start and Follow Through--reflected policy-makers' beliefs in the benefits of citizen participation. In both programs, the intent was to empower poor people to shape programs designed for their benefit.

---

* Many of the most important studies and evaluations are annotated in Citizen Participation in Education: Annotated Bibliography, (Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education, 1978).

Head Start: A Power Sharing Model

Head Start was aimed at early intervention--providing improved health, nutrition and educational services to children three to five years old, prior to their entering kindergarten or first grade. The annual budget for Head Start has grown steadily from less than $100 million in 1966, its first year, to more than a half billion dollars in fiscal year 1978.

From the beginning, Head Start emphasized parent participation in decisionmaking through advisory committees and parent involvement in all aspects of the program. Head Start advisory committees soon developed into policy councils, which, in many cases, have considerable power. It is important to note, however, that the 25 percent of the Head Start policy councils in programs run by school systems appear to have less power and to be more dominated by professionals than those councils which exist in community agencies and programs outside the schools. 1/

Nevertheless, available evidence is that Head Start succeeded more than other large education-related Federal programs in meeting the test of participatory democracy since parent participation structures were in some cases real policy councils. At the very least, it represents an impressive and durable effort to demonstrate the concept of citizen power sharing with government officials and professionals.

Follow Through: Linking Parents and Pupil Achievements

Like Head Start, Follow Through started with emphasis on a comprehensive approach to children's needs and to social change. When the program was transferred to the Office of Education in 1969, and when it failed to grow substantially in funding, the focus became much narrower. The emphasis shifted to compensatory education to improve the academic achievement of poor children and to evaluating alternative models to accomplish this aim. Parent participation was continued but viewed simply as a means to improved student achievement.

The limited evidence available from our recent interviews indicates a wide variation in the degree to which legislative requirements for parent participation are actually used in local projects. This ranges from projects which almost completely ignore the requirements to those that were initiatied by parents and are now run by them.

Follow Through and the Afram Associates

One interesting perspective on Follow Through and its relationship to the minority communities comes from briefly reviewing the experience of Afram Associates, a national, predominantly black group headed by Preston Wilcox, a well-known spokesperson for black community control. The organization was funded by the Office of Education to organize, assist, and assess a group of Follow Through projects in community-based schools across the country, in the same way that Follow Through was linked with various universities to aid and sponsor local Follow Through

projects.*

In the Afram projects, parental participation in decisionmaking was considered an absolute necessity, education was viewed as an instrument for social change and community development, and strengthening the family and its supportive bonds was seen as an important goal. Consequently, Afram rejected evaluation of its projects on the basis of standardized test scores and other conventional measures of student performance. Conflict with the Office of Education resulted, and in the spring of 1976, the Follow Through program decided not to refund Afram. According to the Center for New Schools report:

> The position of the Federal funders was that Afram refused to follow proper procedures and that the services being provided by Afram at that point were unclear. Afram's perspective was that it was not refunded because it refused to put the maintenance of relations with funders above its direct work with parents, because it pressed for more parent control of Follow Through, and because it encouraged local self-reliance and encouraged local sites to take primary credit for their successes rather than fostering dependency and claiming major credit for Afram. 2/

The experience of the Follow Through program with Afram Associates throws into vivid relief an important dilemma in Federal efforts to foster citizen participation. Many Federal programs designed for poor and minority communities purport to serve a double-edged purpose: to improve the quality of education and simultaneously foster community development or social change. Since Congressional intent is often ambiguous about which aim should be given priority, agency administrators are given wide latitude in administering programs such as Follow Through.

Despite the inherent possibilities for flexible program administration, bureaucrats tend to see educational improvements--in the purely technical sense--as the safest course. They, like many school officials, assume that better reading scores will lead to economic and social advancement in the community.

The Afram Associates' work with several Follow Through projects challenged this approach as Afram insisted that improvements in children' schooling and general achievement were possible only as a consequence of overall community development. The Afram controversy, like the community control controversies in the 1960's, clearly reflects the cultural confusion and social contradictions between individualism and group values, the melting pot and pluralism, and populism and commitment to science (in this case, standardized testing). More specifically, the Afram incident raises the question: Is it possible to develop a respect-

---

* This material about Afram Associates' work with Follow Through is adapted from Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools, (Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education, 1978).

ful and durable funding relationship between a Federal education agency and a community-based citizens' organization which challenges prevailing values and practices?

Title I

The participatory themes struck in the 1960's are now reflected in most Federal education programs. Nearly all new laws since 1971 have contained some form of citizen participation. Nine separate programs for elementary and secondary education require advisory committees at the local district or school building level. The largest and most important is Title I, which was the cornerstone of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by Congress in 1965--the culmination of decades of hitherto unsuccessful efforts to enact a large-scale support program for the secondary schools.

Title I is a compensatory educational program for economically disadvantaged students. It has grown from an appropriation of just under a billion dollars in fiscal year 1966 to close to three billion dollars in the current fiscal year. With programs in 14,000 of the nation's 16,000 school districts, Title I has an estimated 60,000 parent advisory committees (14,000 district PAC's; another 44,000 school-level PAC's) and an estimated membership of about 900,000. 3/ Unlike most of the other mid-1960's antipoverty programs, Title I did not include any specific participatory requirements, but Office of Education administrators encouraged parent and other community involvement. In Program Guide No. 46, 1978, the Office of Education recommended establishment of local advisory councils. Some districts followed this recommendation, but no figures are available.

The 1970 revision of ESEA empowered the Commissioner of Education to require parent involvement, and, in fall 1971, Title I guidelines were amended to require districtwide parent councils--with parents constituting more than a simple majority--to participate in the planning, development, operation and evaluation of the projects. Title I legislation was amended again, in the Education Amendments of 1974, to require both a district council and individual parent advisory councils for each school receiving funds.

The revised regulations by the Office of Education in 1976 for Title I state that each parent advisory council must have "as a majority of its members, (a) parents of children (including parents of private school children) who are currently participating in the program, or (b) parents of children who will participate in the projects proposed for the following fiscal year, if satisfactory data is available to identify such children." 4/ Members of the councils are to be selected by the parents in either the district or the school attendance areas. In addition, the regulations include an option for districts to have an intermediate parent council acting as a liaison between the school and the district council. Office of Education officials say that this option was included to provide a mechanism to parallel multi-level decentralization plans in cities such as Chicago, Detroit and New York.

Only limited data about the nature, scope and impact of local Title I Parent Advisory Councils are available but several important evaluations are underway. One study is a general evaluation of Title I, commissioned by NIE and carried out by the Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse University. This study will examine the parent committees specifically. Another evaluation--even more relevant--is the "Study of the Impact of Parent Advisory Councils Upon the Management and Administration of Title I Programs at the Local Level," also commissioned by NIE. 5/ Recently, the Office of Education issued an RFP for a very large three-year evaluation of Title I parent participation. Our own interviews and literature search lead to a number of important impressions, which can be confirmed or modified as further work is done.

There is a great deal of variation among States, among cities within States, and even among individual schools within the same district. In some places, the Title I PAC's, whether districtwide or individual school-based, reportedly hardly exist except on paper, meeting only the letter of the Federal requirement. In many other places, the district PAC's exist and meet, but are dominated by central office administrators assigned responsibility for Title I. Similarly, many school-level PAC's are dominated by the building principal. As is true with other modes of citizen participation, the effectiveness of PAC's is strongly influenced by political variables--the history and tradition of political decision-making and school community relations in each school, district and State. These distinct political climates have a strong influence on the State agency staff members and the central office or building administrators who set the conditions which encourage or discourage various kinds of PAC roles, activities and influence. These conditions include who gets administrative jobs and their subsequent behavior.

In addition, Title I and its parent advisory mechanisms operate as a relatively separate and closed system within a large school district. Title I PAC's and their parent members tend to focus very tightly on Title I concerns alone which isolates them from related activities; this parallels the isolation of Title I administrators in central school districts and State education agencies.

While Title I participatory mechanisms, operating at both citywide and at the local school level, have the potential for high levels of impact, both in the shaping of policy and in the delivery of services to the schools, only rarely do they achieve this potential. This is due, in large measure, to the combination of an unclear mandate and a lack of resources.

There are recent indications that some local PAC's are beginning to be more active; this is due, in part, to the work of national citizen-initiated organizations such as the National Coalition for Title I Parents, the Federal Education Project of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under the Law, the Title I projects of the American Friends Service Committee, the citizen training institutes of the National Committee for Citizens in Education, and the workshops of the Center for Parent Involvement in Berkeley.

Because of the eligibility requirements of Title I, the low-income citizens who participate in its operation are those most directly concerned with the progress and final outcome of programs involving their children. Therefore, in essence, Title I set a precedent by its insistence on parent participation rather than that of other community residents. These programs serve three disadvantaged target populations: poor children, non-English-speaking children and Indian children. Parents of these children, low-income people who historically had not participated effectively in organized citizen groups, are, because of Title I impetus, now serving in substantial numbers as members of local advisory committees.

Citizen participation through Title I falls far short of meeting an absolute test of participatory democracy. However, the mandate has made it easier for low-income people to come closer to the decisionmaking process, and opens the way for increased power sharing.

Urban/Rural School Development Program

One of the first Office of Education efforts to implement citizen participation in decisionmaking, the Urban/Rural School Development Program, which was funded projects in 25 cities during 1971-1977, was designed to improve the education of poor children. The program, a part of the Education Professions Development Act, emphasized staff development and was built around a school-community council, which was given control over project funds and project planning. The program was relatively small in scope and funding (less than 75 million dollars over longer than six years). It received little national notice and produced a minimum amount of controversy even though it explicitly embraced the concept of participatory democracy.

This recent assessment report indicates that the concept of citizen-educator parity in decisionmaking was successfully achieved in many of the sites. The evaluation concludes:

1. School-community councils with approximately equal representation of school officials--mainly teachers--and community people can be established and can achieve parity in structure and operation in making decisions.

2. The work of such councils, through shared decisionmaking by the main parties affected, has a positive effect on morale in the district; improves the variety, quality and quantity of inservice education; and, based on such evidence as is available, apparently leads to better learning by students.

3. When Federal support ended after six years, the communities tried to carry on and to incorporate the experimental work into their regular programs.

These evaluators assert that the program is having wider influence

as Urban/Rural concepts and experience are being used to help shape two new Federal programs, notably the new five-year cycle Teacher Corps, which requires by legislative mandates a community council. 6/

General Patterns of Limitations

Nine Office of Education programs require local community councils or advisory committees: bilingual education, education of disadvantaged children (Title I), Follow Through, Education of the Handicapped (three different programs), Supplementary Education Centers and Services (ESEA, Title III--which has been terminated by consolidation), School Health and Nutrition for Low-Income Children, Emergency School Assistance Act, Indian Education and Ethnic Heritage Studies.

None of these have the explicit commitment to power-sharing found in the Urban/Rural or Head Start programs. The Teacher Corps is not included in the list nor in the analysis which follows as its mandated community councils are being implemented for the first time in the fall of 1978, after this report was compiled.

Our recent survey of the advisory committee requirements in Office of Education programs reveals some important general patterns and limitations.*

The committees are districtwide, except for Title I which requires both districtwide and individual school committees. However, some programs such as Follow Through and School Health and Nutrition typically take place in one school or a cluster of schools in a district.

The regulations for most of these programs stress membership requirements and committee composition. They are often very detailed and prescriptive on membership, and very vague and general in regard to functions and conditions of operation.

Student participation in advisory or consultative mechanisms is specified in just three cases (in all three, the specification is in regulations rather than the legislation itself): Bilingual Education,

---

* A separate publication (available on request and at cost) presents a listing of all the current Office of Education programs with the specific legislative and regulatory language which deals with citizen participation. A total of 106 programs are listed. Only 33 programs have no participatory language, either in the law or regulations. Of these, 21 are higher education programs such as work-study and basic opportunity grants, and 3 are library programs. Only 5 are specifically for elementary and secondary education: Impact Aid, one small program for deaf children, Metric Education, Education for Gifted and Talented Children and Youth, and a small school arts program.

Drop Out Prevention, and the Emergency School Assistance Program. In the latter program, biracial student advisory committees are mandated.

As in the case of citizen participation mechanisms of the poverty program, lack of clarity about mandate and lack of clear overall coordination of participatory structures lead to difficulties at the local program level. The clearest and most consistent Federal policy is that local-level citizen participation should be advisory or consultative in function.

However, "advice" or "consultation" can have many meanings. Some precision could be achieved by anticipating and specifying clear lines of communication, authority and accountability between program advisory committees and others involved in school governance and program administration. But no legislation or regulations recognize the possibility of overlapping or contradictory participatory requirements and no specifications or guidelines suggest how such problems might be dealt with should they occur within advisory committees. The possibility of conflicts between advisory groups and administrators or school boards exists and provisions for resolving such conflicts remain ambiguous.

Local Implementation

Ambiguity of Federal education requirements is reflected in the difficulties of implementing programs at the local level. Uncertain Congressional and executive purpose, and inability to enforce requirements, sanctions the natural resistance of most local school boards, school administrators and teachers' organizations to share power with parents and other community residents.

Moreover, these school members, administrators and teachers are given little help in learning how to perform new functions and carry out new responsibilities in relation to their communities. There exist only scattered examples of providing the community members of the mandated committees with training, technical assistance or continuing staff support.

Consequences of Federal Education Programs

The Federal education laws--even though they contribute less than eight percent of the total cost of running the public schools--have had a large and spiraling impact on most American school districts. Despite their failure to produce dramatic successes in terms of student achievement or institutional change, these programs have had major effects. There has been a clear, if modest, redistributive effect on educational resources for children who are poor, non-English-speaking, and physically or mentally handicapped.

An important consequence, probably not anticipated by policymakers, is that the programs encourage the recentralization of school authority, which was to some extent decentralized in urban districts in the late

1960's and early 1970's. For example, the administration of Title I appears to have a strong centralizing influence. Local Title I bureaucracies are centralized units and appear to be largely exempt from various city initiatives for decentralization plans and for investing area superintendents with greater authority. The centralized Title I bureaucracy in a city must interact with a centralized State bureaucracy. This agency, in turn, interacts with the largely centralized Office of Education Title I bureaucracy in Washington. This three-level system of bureaucratic control appears to prevent power and influence devolving to parent councils.

Title I is not the only Federal project exerting centralizing pressure on city school districts. Similar pressures arise from the operation of the Emergency School Assistance Act, bilingual education and vocational educational programs in the cities.

The requirements for local advisory committees may tend to weaken voluntary associations. While the new mandated organizations give working-class parents new and direct access to the schools, in some cases they may tend to draw participants away from citizen-initiated organizations in the same schools.

Many of these groups did have an impact on school policy in the 1960's, causing the hiring of minority teachers and administrators, installation of bilingual educational programs, and more equitable allocation of funds among schools within a district. Since then, their visibility appears to have declined.

Mixed results combined with ambiguous purposes and fragmented implementation characterize the Federal educational mandates for citizen participation since 1970. It is not surprising that the patterns are so unclear, given the social contradictions that provide their framework: contradictions between and among local control, Federal intervention to protect minority interests, populism, and deference to professional expertise.

THE INFLUENCE OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

As we point out in Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools, the influence of State governments on local school affairs has increased markedly over the past two decades.

State impact will probably increase as States assume a larger percentage of the costs of operating local public schools. This percentage has risen from a national average of 40.5 percent in 1961-62 to 47.5 percent in 1976-77. 7/ State finance reform is working to increase the percentage of State support and will probably continue to do so.

The most important example of strong State influence over the past fifty years is rural consolidation. Most States have intervened strongly to close small schools and to consolidate rural and town schools.

Between 1950 and 1974, for example, financial incentives have led to the reduction of the number of public school districts by more than 80 percent--from 84,000 districts in 1950 to about 16,000 in 1976. 8/ The reduction of the number of districts reduces the number of school board members and increases the number of constituents each represents.

The rural school consolidation movement parallels the centralization of urban districts; it was supported by the same reform forces and appears to have had roughly the same effects: centralized and bureaucratic school management, strong professional domination, increased costs and greater sense of distance between citizens and the schools.

Another example of recent State impact is the form of State collective bargaining legislation. About two-thirds of the States have legislated bargaining rights for teachers and other public employees. These laws provide the major tools for the development of the power of employee organizations as they relate to school officials at the local level and to educational policies at the State level. These laws often make community access to decisionmaking more difficult. In a countertrend, a few States have sought to provide explicitly for public access in the process: Florida has a sunshine law for collective bargaining; California's new Rodda Act assures citizen access to information about the bargaining agenda.

Increased State Role in the 1970's

There are three main reasons for the increases in the State role in the 1970's. First, there is the Constitutional aspect as expressed in the Dillon Rule; second, Federal initiatives have increased activities and financial resources at the State level; and, third, there is a marked increase in the capacity of the State to intervene.

Constitutional Aspect

The dramatic increase of State influence in local educational affairs in the past few decades has been buttressed by the longstanding, prevailing view of State supremacy expressed in the Dillon Rule. For education, this rule means that running the public schools is primarily a State function, delegated to local school districts. Local action must conform to guidelines established by State education agencies. Though infrequently invoked in the past, the Dillon Rule has always permitted State regulations to supersede local policies and practices. Recent State intervention in public schooling is not a change in principle or law, but a break from the laissez-faire practices common to earlier State education agencies. 9/

Increase in State Capacity

Temple University's Center for the Study of Federalism documents the quiet revolution that has transformed State government since the 1950's and has resulted in substantial increases in the capacities of State executive and legislative branches to formulate and implement

policy. 10/ The strengthening of the State has had important repercussions on education. Alan Rosenthal, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, directly links the States' growing involvement in education to changes in their legislatures' policymaking capacity, internal distribution of power, habits of work and composition. 11/ Initiatives are exerted not only in policy formulation, but in oversight and control, putting more pressure on State education agencies. These agencies themselves have dramatically expanded in scope of operation and staff competency, with much of this change traceable to increases in Federal requirements, programs and funding.

Federal Influences on the States in Education

The expansion of the State role in education has been strongly influenced by Federal funding and priorities for education. For example, by 1968, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was channeling more than one billion dollars through the States to support a range of federally-initiated (and frequently locally operated) programs. At this stage, more than 41 percent of all State Education Agency expenditures, including salaries, were federally funded. 12/ Agencies' staffs expanded dramatically, as some State Education Agencies became organizational replicas of the U.S. Office of Education, while others forged new structures to coordinate new administrative tasks. 13/ The Federal focus on compensatory and bilingual education and on support for programs for the handicapped stimulated new State interest and commitments in these areas. The Federal laws and regulations encouraged both State-level advisory committees and public participation in goal setting, needs assessment and comprehensive State planning. Both trends are reflected in recent State initiatives to encourage citizen participation.

Survey of State Actions

A survey conducted by the Education Commission of the States and IRE reveals a varied and substantial State legislative and education agency activity to encourage citizen participation.* The pattern is remarkably similar to that of Federal-level initiatives dealing with

---

* This survey was conducted in February 1977: A questionnaire was distributed by ECS requesting States to provide information on legislation, regulations, projects and studies related to citizen participation in educational decisionmaking initiated since 1970. The 27 responding States represented the 10 Federal regions and included both industrial and rural locales. The sampling, therefore, reflects a national cross-section. Seventeen States reported legislative action during that time period and 22 reported some type of action by the State Board of Education or the State Education Agency. The results of this survey are reported in more detail in IRE's Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools.

planning and participation. Just as Federal requirements established councils or committees, so has State action. In some cases, the Federal mandate of "target population" committees is followed (e.g., bilingual, handicapped), in other cases general purpose, local committees were suggested or required.

At the State level, membership is rigidly prescribed; at the local level, membership may be more open, but functions are restricted. The emphasis is on advice and consultation. There is, however, often encouragement for broad participation in comprehensive planning at the State or local level. Although the planning process may include four, five or six steps in a cycle from goal-setting through implementation, evaluation and redesign, guidelines rarely allude to public participation after the first phase.

Our review of these State initiatives suggests that, in general, the designs of implementation strategies have the same flaws as Federal ones. A commitment of public involvement is announced--without technical assistance or support for administrators or the public, often without monitoring or evaluation; often without funding. There are exceptions. Colorado, for example, in implementing 1971 legislation for accountability has required that local advisory councils participate in an eight-step planning process and report on progress to the community and to the State Board of Education. The Department of Education offers technical assistance and monitors compliance. In addition, Massachusetts, California, South Carolina and South Dakota have produced publications to assist local collaborative efforts. Three States--Texas, Wyoming and Illinois--describe provisions for technical assistance. South Dakota, Virginia and Florida have specific monitoring or reporting requirements. A few States have made some type of link with funding, but only the California Early Childhood Education law gave the parent advisory committee a budget under their control, and, thus, some resources.

Because of the limited data available in documents, supplementary field data from California and Florida offer a richer perspective on the experiences of innovation and implementation. Both States have pioneered efforts to equalize educational opportunity by mandating comprehensive planning and public involvement in educational decisionmaking. During the past decade, both States have legislated new procedures for the delivery of educational services to meet individual student needs. In addition to programs for compensatory and bilingual education and education for the handicapped, these laws have addressed: school finance reform, instruction in basic skill areas, minimum standards for student achievement, State assessment programs and early childhood education.

It is interesting to note that South Carolina has joined California and Florida as a "lead State" in fostering local citizen participation with the passage of a new education finance act in 1977. The law is designed not only to establish a system of financial aid that upgrades educational opportunity for all children regardless of the wealth of the district in which they reside, but also mandates that each school board shall establish an advisory council at each school. 14/

Florida

In 1973, the Florida State legislature moved toward more flexible program funding, better reporting and accountability for results in the schools, and a system of citizen advisory committees. The package was designed to encourage better school-community relations and to improve understanding of, and support for, educational funding and programs. Those in leadership positions saw the need for a conceptual framework which could provide a basis for comprehensive policy reform. The Governor's Advisory Committee, active in 1971 and 1972, was responsible for major work towards this goal. 15/ The development of new procedures for school accreditation, refinement of management information procedures, and shifts in financing preceded the 1973 legislation, which synthesized many of these developments and included requirements for school advisory councils. Amendments legislated in 1976 further extended and refined purposes and procedures. Interviews with legislative and agency leaders affirm the view that the statutes currently in place adequately address basic issues related to equity, quality and involvement in education. There is a widespread agreement, however, that implementation has been weak.

A study just completed for the Florida legislature shows a substantial increase in the number of districts with building level advisory committees and growth in the number of citizens participating. 16/

Improving Education in Florida: A Reassessment*

The study points clearly to a problem often found in government mandated efforts to foster citizen participation. The consultants responsible for the study report that at least two factors mitigated against successful implementation: the legislative intent was neither clearly announced nor broadly disseminated and no additional State-level resources (personnel or funding) were made available to monitor or support local efforts. This unintentionally-created vacuum at the State level continues to have a substantial impact on local level implementation as demonstrated by uneven and widely varying efforts throughout the State. Difficulties in implementing school advisory committees are the result of the lack of significant power and authority; isolation of school advisory committees in the local setting as well as in the larger communities; and absence of adequate information, training and other support services to enable citizens to carry our their responsibilities.

The study points to other problems that seem to haunt similar advisory committee programs elsewhere: control of selection of membership and agenda by school administrators and underrepresentation of low-income and minority members.

---

* Prepared for the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature, February 1978.

Only about 10 percent of the Florida committee are reported to be operating "in significant advisory action roles" although the concept of the advisory committee receives strong support from citizens as well as educators.

California

California, while closely paralleling directions taken in Florida, has taken an "incremental" approach. As early as 1971, the Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation, under the chairmanship of Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, was working in conjunction with the Department of Education to provide guidelines and encouragement for school/community involvement in local goal setting. In an interview, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wilson Riles, described step-by-step moves to extend services to special populations, to strengthen instructional programs, and to build public involvement. Prior to the enactment of ESEA Title I, California's Compensatory Education guidelines included requirements for district advisory committees, with parents making up at least 51 percent of membership. The link between the improvement of educational services and participation is reflected in the later laws for bilingual education and education for the handicapped, and in the participatory requirements of the statewide Early Childhood Education program. In Riles' opinion, these laws are designed to increase collaboration between professionals and citizens. Legislators and agency officials anticipate future efforts to consolidate the gains made to date in school reform and in participation.

In 1977, the participatory aspects of the Early Childhood Education program were built into the Education Improvement Program, a component of the new finance reform law. Assembly Bill 65 extended the ECE concept to all grade levels but changed the advisory council mandate to include the "parity" concept with nearly equal representation of educators and citizens. It is too early to report on implementation or on any effects that Proposition 13 may have on either State or local commitment to the new program.

Common Constraints in the Two States

In both States, key legislators have provided strong leadership for reform and for mandated citizen participation. Both States have received firm encouragement and support from senior officials in the State Department of Education. However, aggressive leadership at the State level in education produces tensions between legislators and agency administrators as well as among State and local agencies. Legislators tend to be skeptical that State agencies have the will or capacity to implement successfully the laws they pass; agency officials, while admitting the need for retraining and upgrading State agency staff, fear that legislators may have a simplistic view of the task and may underestimate the resources needed for implementation. Neither legislators nor agency officials have resolved the basic ambivalence between firmness and flexibility in laws or regulations. State leaders face the same dilemma as their Federal counterparts: narrow specifications for

implementation create rigidities which hamper local initiatives and responses to local problems; vague or general directives simply affirm a desired goal without sufficient muscle to ensure compliance. In addition, State Education Agency staff face resistance from local districts who object to the inexorable escalation of regulations.

Neither legislators nor administrators receive substantial public support for their efforts to increase public participation in schools. In both States, interviewees commented on the absence of citizen groups advocating stronger requirements for participation. Those attempting to establish school site councils or school-based management are hindered by the well-organized resistance of educational professionals and, in some cases, of the established State-level parent groups. There appear to be few strong State-level organizations speaking for increased public participation, or monitoring the implementation of mandates for participation.

Equally serious obstacles are encountered in implementing imaginative and complex programs with requirements for participation. One obvious difficulty is the multiplicity of efforts. Both individual State programs and well-established Federal programs create groups to focus on compensatory, bilingual, early childhood education, and education for the handicapped. Since these groups are added to the already existing PTA's, confusion and competition are almost inevitable.

The "Equity-Efficiency" Dilemma in the States

The rapid growth of State activity must be taken seriously by those concerned about citizen participation in the schools. The emergence of the school advisory council as the primary mode of participation is especially significant. These school advisory councils are intermediate structures in the political process which open access especially to those previously excluded from decisionmaking. Elected officials, by definition, cannot adequately serve this purpose. The intermediate structure provides an area for information, exchange, debate and negotiation of differences; it fosters political vitality. Comprehensive planning addresses system efficiency--the need to plan, manage and evaluate operations in a way which successfully translates decisions into action and services at the least cost. In the pursuit of equality of opportunity, the two are necessarily related. Political activism without adequate tools for implementing decisions can lead only to frustration. System efficiency based on decisions made without adequate representation of those to be served can only perpetuate existing inequities.

The council structures and the planning functions can, however, be mutually contradictory and, to the degree that short-term cost considerations dominate, they are in conflict. If there is integrity in the process of developing broadly representative structures which address serious educational issues with sophistication and sound judgement, both programmers and participants will devote substantial time and energy to tasks of organization-building, goal clarification, problem solving, and

conflict resolution. If the major commitment is to a narrowly defined system efficiency, administrative resources will be invested in developing the minimal level of public support necessary for realizing predetermined goals.

Evidence from the States indicates that, except in a few rare instances, local participation in councils and in comprehensive planning follow two separate tracks; one emphasizes political vitality, the other stresses system efficiency. This division masks fundamental value commitments and makes it possible to ignore the latent value conflicts. As furtive as they may be, State efforts to integrate participatory structures and planning functions at least present an opportunity to confront one dimension of the "equity-efficiency" dilemma as it is posed for education today.

Influence of the Courts

Both State and Federal courts have had a powerful influence on the public schools over the past three decades. Groups of citizens have come to see legal action as their clearest and most direct means of obtaining policy changes and influencing decisionmaking. Litigation--and the threat of litigation--has become a highly significant and influential form of participation.

The most important court influence has been in school desegregation. In Chapter III we indicate that court actions have provided legitimatizations for citizen participation in scores of desegregating districts.

A companion report points out that both Federal and State courts have handed down decisions which require citizen participation in schools. However, the courts continue to honor the prerogatives of administrators and show deference to the expertise of administrative agencies in their own spheres of authority. Since most State and Federal statutes and regulations call for advisory roles for citizens, they have not been viewed by the courts as the bases for more expansive rulings supporting citizen participation. Only in desegregation cases has the constitutional right of the public to share in school decisionmaking been explicitly set forth.

CHAPTER II - REFERENCES

1. Kirchner Associates, Inc., "A Proposal for a Study of the Impact of Parent Advisory Councils Upon the Management and Administration of Title I programs at the Local Level," submitted to the National Institute of Education, Washington D.C., August 23, 1976, pp.4-5

2. Quoted from "Assistance Strategies of Site Groups that Facilitate Change at the School/Community Level," A Report for the National Institute of Education, Final Report, vol. 1 (Chicago: Center for New Schools, February 1977).

3. National Center for Education Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977).

4. "Summary of Office of Education Program Requirements for Citizen Participation" (Unpublished).

5. Kirschner Associates, Inc.

6. "Involvement: A Study of Shared Governance of Teacher Education ed. Bruce R. Joyce (Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, 1978), p. 12.

7. National Center for Education Statistics, Statistics of the State School Systems (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

8. Jonathan P. Sher and Rachel B. Tompkins, "Myths of Rural and District Consolidation," Educational Forum (January 1977).

9. Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools, (Boston, Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, June 1978) Chapter IV, "Judicial Activism" by Felix Baxter. pp. 56-80.

10. Daniel J. Elazar, "The New Federalism: Can the States be Trusted?" Social Policy (spring 1974).

11. "The Emerging Legislative Role in Education," Compact (winter 1977).

12. Mike M. Milstein, Impact and Response: Federal Aid and State Education Agencies (New York: Teachers College Press, 1976).

13. See, for example, Stephen K. Bailey and Edyth K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1968); Jay D. Scribner, "Impact of Federal Programs on State Departments of Education," in Education in the States: Nationwide Developments Since 1900, ed. Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1969)--focusing on ESEA Title III; and Joel S. Burke and Michael W. Kirst, Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs? (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1972).

14. On July 1, 1977, the South Carolina State Legislature passed the South Carolina Education Finance Act of 1977 designed to establish "a system of financial aid that recognizes variations in local fiscal ability and upgrades educational opportunities for every child regardless of where he lives." Section 6, Paragraph 3:6 of that Act mandates that "each school board shall establish an advisory council at each school."

15. Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, Improving Education in Florida: A Report, Florida State Legislature (Tallahassee, Fla., March 1973). ED 078 531.

16. Improving Education in Florida: A Reassessment, Progress Report for the Select Joint Committee on Public Schools of the Florida Legislature (February 1978).

CHAPTER III

WHO PARTICIPATES? HOW? AND IN WHAT ISSUES?

Individual citizens participate in their own individual ways in a wide range of school-related issues. They do so to carry out multiple functions, those that they identify as well as those identified for them by schools or mandating agencies such as the courts or Congress. Our data confirm the importance of the interrelationships among form, function, participants and issues. The dynamics vary over the course of time, and according to issue and locale. The most useful starting point is function--what citizens seek to do individually or collectively.

Functions of Participation

We have developed a nine-part classification scheme that encompasses all the functions that we have identified, either in the field or in the literature. These categories, which are not mutually exclusive, are as follows:

Information

Included in this category are all those functions usually covered by the term "public relations"--providing information to the community about the schools; receiving information about the schools; and, providing information to the media, community agencies, and other citizen organizations. Also included is providing the school board and school staff with information about the community, its needs and perspectives.

Service

This category includes services to children such as tutoring, program enrichment or after school recreation and cultural activities; services to parents, such a child care or counselling; and services to school staff, such as classroom assistance, bus monitoring or raising money for school purposes. Examples vary from job counselling for community residents, to actual job training, or simply providing opportunities for making friends and engaging in enjoyable social activities.

Advising and Decisionmaking

These two functions are the keystone of citizen participation. Advisory and decisionmaking/policymaking cut across the areas of budget, personnel, program, facilities, student discipline and extra-curricular activities.

These twin functions are the focus of this report.

Planning and Development

A wide variety of activities are included in this category, these range from goal setting to proposal writing to producing or reviewing instructional materials.

Research and Evaluation

Needs assessment in school and community, and gathering data about community or school problems are the most common functions in this classification. The activities can range from participation in formal research or program evaluation to informal ad hoc studies.

Monitoring/Reporting

Citizen monitoring of court ordered desegregation, which requires reporting to the school board and the court, is one example of this function. Reporting is sometimes ad hoc and private; sometimes continuing and public (as with the reports of annual school progress in Florida).

Training

This includes training others (students, parents, community residents, school staff) and being trained oneself for a particular job. This is often reported to be an underdeveloped function for many citizen organizations.

Advocacy

Protection of clients or constituents is an advocacy function now widespread in urban citizen organizations involved in school affairs. Litigation is often one aspect of this function.

Electoral Politics

This function focuses on supporting individuals for elective office, including school councils or school boards, and such electoral activities as voter registration and providing information about elections and candidates.

Maintenance

Citizen organizations often perform many internal functions necessary to the continued life of the organization itself. These can range from fundraising to maintaining books and records and include recruiting and electing members. School-related social activities may also be considered a part of this survival function.

Most organizations have multiple functions, shifting emphasis among these as issues change, new participants or leaders become involved, mandates are revised, and funding sources alter their priorities. One of the impressions that stands out most clearly in this survey of the status of

citizen participation is the wide variety of forms of participation.

HOW CITIZENS PARTICIPATE

Participation in schools takes both individual and collective forms. Our emphasis is on organizations through which citizens seek to influence educational decisionmaking collectively. However, several primarily individual forms of participation must be identified at the outset if contemporary patterns are to be adequately understood.

Individual Participation

Individual parent involvement is reported to be on the upswing; school volunteer programs have grown substantially over the past fifteen years, providing tutoring and other forms of citizen assistance to children and school staff. Many Federal and State programs encourage parents to work in the schools as teacher aides and other auxiliary roles. Traditional, apolitical forms of individual involvement--serving as room mothers, aiding with field trips--also continue. Both foundation and Federal funds have encouraged the development of parent training programs designed to help parents do their child-rearing better (and to provide supplementary educational experiences for their children). Nearly all these individual activities are defined in our lexicon as apolitical involvement rather than participation. But they may be simultaneously related to other forms. Parents who first come to the schools as aides and helpers may be motivated to join with other parents to change school policies and programs. Conversely, citizens who participate in organized groups concentrating on school policy issues, may come into the schools to tutor. In practice, our neat classification of forms breaks down and functions blend. However, neither the literature nor our field studies shed much light on these interrelations. They remain of potential significance for future research.

Programs for Handicapped Children

One of the most important new forms of individual participation is the mandated opportunity for parents of handicapped children to participate in their children's education. In several states, programs for handicapped children exist, and, at the national level, the new Federal Education for All Handicapped Children Act, provides parents with the right to participate in the development of their children's special educational plans. Their approval of the proposed program is required; therefore varying forms of involvement and participation are likely to result. This development provides a striking example of increased parent power the implications of which have not yet been realized. Legislation for handicapped children was brought about largely through the work of active local, state and national citizen organizations advocating improved services for the handicapped.

Voucher Plans

Voucher plans--which offer participation in the form of choice--were first promoted by conservative economist Milton Friedman as a way of introducing marketplace competition to schooling. Vouchers equalling the

cost of schooling would be issued to parents, who could redeem them in any institution meeting minimum standards established by the State. The idea attracted an array of both conservative and liberal advocates, and the Office of Economic Opportunity during the Nixon administration initiated an experimental program. From the start, virtually all educational interest groups opposed the plan as a threat to the public school system. Despite planning grants funded by OEO to establish pilot vouchers, plans were thwarted in both Connecticut and New Hampshire. The only pilot program field test occurred in Alum Rock, a school district in the San Jose, California area, where it was limited to the public schools. It produced discouraging results for its advocates, although some parents, teachers and outside observers expressed satisfaction with the program. An evaluation by the Rand Corporation was critical of the implementation of the Alum Rock experiment, claiming that the program failed to stimulate much parent participation and widen the range of educational opportunities. 1/ An even more negative evaluation was reported by the Southwest Network, a Chicano advocacy group, which was critical of the concept, the district's failure to inform or involve the community in planning and curriculum development, and failure to make sure that compensatory education funds reached the intended children. 2/

Alternative Schools

A second major form of individual participation through choice has been much more widespread. The movement flourished in the 1960's and early 1970's and continues today. In many cases, middle-class parents, dissatisfied with rigid and traditional public schools, were the initiators of alternative schools following the "freedom school" model. Many of the new schools were independent, finding financial support from foundations, private donors, and tuition. Others were developed within public school systems.

The common element was curricular choice for dissatisfied students and parents. In many instances, the new schools provided for substantial student and parent participation in governance. Nearly all private alternative schools experience severe financial difficulties; many do not survive. Alternative schools within public schools systems face fewer financial problems, but often must sacrifice autonomy and distinctiveness to bureaucratic pressures. Three well-known examples of alternative schools will be mentioned here briefly as illustrations of a complex, nationwide phenomenon.

Harlem Prep developed in New York as a private school for high school dropouts and young people with public school diplomas, but few skills or adequate preparation for college. The school was characterized by the participation of black parents and community leaders on the Board of Directors and the use of parents and other community people as volunteers. Despite reported successes, the program succumbed to financial pressures and became a part of the New York Public Schools. It is not certain whether Harlem Prep will maintain its distinctiveness and strong community ties.

In Cambridge, Massachusetts, an alternative within the public school system was developed with the assistance of staff of the Harvard Graduate School of Education and a grant from the U.S. Office of Education under the Education Professions Development Act. The success of The Pilot School led to the development of other public school alternatives in Cambridge, inclu-

ding a new Fundamental High School created by parents who support the back-to-basics movement.

In Los Angeles, white middle-class parents worked successfully to establish an alternative school within one of the district's administrative areas. The concept was extended to three additional areas. Parents played a strong role in governance in the schools and developed a citywide council to advance the interests of alternative schools. Some of the autonomy and program distinctiveness of these schools have been lost in the recent past, according to an active member of the Los Angeles Association of Alternative Public schools (AAPS).

Spurred by the advocacy of influential educators such as Mario Fantini, the alternative school concept was adapted by some public school systems to provide educational options within a single school building or within a cluster of public schools. The Quincy, Illinois and Minneapolis Southeast Alternative projects are examples of the implementation of this form of participation. 3/

Collective Participation

Having briefly examined individual participation, our main discussion will now focus on the types of groups in which citizens are participating collectively. Using the terminology presented and defined in the Introduction to this report, these groups are categorized by:

- Origins: mandated as opposed to citizen-initiated.
- Geographic Scope: national, statewide, citywide, local.
- Auspices: affiliated, i.e. local chapters of larger organizations, vs. non-affiliated or independent groups.
- Issue Focus: single issue refers to a primary orientation towards education and schools whereas multi-issue refers to other civic and voluntary associations with a wider focus.

These categories include a variety of groups; they range from school-site and districtwide parent advisory councils, to traditional PTA's and PTO's, to citywide education coalitions, to neighborhood associations. They are used as a guide for the discussion which follows, and serve as "descriptors" in the organizational census appended to this chapter. The census lists all organizations interviewed during the course of this study; the listing is alphabetical by the organization's proper name. The table further categorizes each organization according to the typology above.

Organized citizen participation can be either mandated (by the Federal government or a local court, school board or superintendent) or voluntary, sparked by the spontaneous parent or citizen initiative.

Mandated Forms

The most common types of mandated participation are citywide advisory committees and school councils or school site advisory committees.

Citywide Advisory Committees

Across the country, thousands of citizens serve on a large number of ad hoc and specifically focused advisory committees. Traditionally, these committees are appointed by school superintendents. They are primarily elite, middle-class groups. In the past few years, some citywide advisory committees have been created by school boards or mandated by outside agencies, such as those ordered by Federal courts in school desegregation decisions. Planning, advising and information functions predominate. Mandated groups in desegregating districts usually focus on monitoring and reporting to the court or other governmental body overseeing desegregation.

School Site Advisory Committees

As indicated in Chapter II, local advisory councils based in school buildings are created by government mandate. They comprise the predominant new mode of citizen participation. Such committees, with countless different names, are created by Federal, State and local legislation. We describe these groups in some detail in Volume II, indicating both the wide range of functions performed by these councils and the characteristic lack of clarity about their function and authority.

Voluntary Forms

Voluntary, citizen-initiated organizations with a primary focus on education include traditional parent associations such as the PTA, citywide education groups, and neighborhood education organizations.

PTA-PTO's

The most prevalent form of school-related citizen activity remains the traditional parent association. The nation's largest citizen group concerned with school and youth related issues is the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, a non-profit organization unaffiliated with any government agency. The National PTA Congress traditionally has allied itself with other national educational organizations and with local and State school board groups to support increasing all governmental expenditures for educational programs.

Recently, the national PTA has adopted a more aggressive program. It is now involved in efforts to alter collective bargaining practices. It has also begun to wage a campaign against the television networks to reduce the violence in entertainment programming.

State units of PTA are voluntary and independent. Local units are often started by parents and not dependent on the public schools for financial support. However, they most often function within the school system and are controlled by it. Before a change in the national charter in the early 1970's, the role of local units was limited to supporting schools. The traditional

functions have been information, training (parent education), and service. Some units are broadening their scope of functions. We have uncovered widely divergent views about the potential value and future role of the new and somewhat more flexible PTA's. Much further study of the relationships between these groups and other forms of citizen participation is needed.

Citywide Educational Associations

One of the classic and continuing modes of citizen participation in the schools is the citywide educational organization. Some of the best known groups include: the Public Educational Association of New York City (the oldest and largest of this type); the D.C. Citizens for Better Schools; the Philadelphia Committee for Public Education; the Philadelphia Parents Union; the Citizen Schools Committee in Chicago; and the San Francisco Service Bureau for Public Education.

Most of these groups have been middle-class and elite in membership, closely tied to city and school district leadership. Most emphasize conducting orientation and training for citizens concerned about schools and educational policy. Many see themselves as watchdogs for citizen interests affected by school officials' policies. In recent years, some of these groups, notably PEA in New York City, have made strong efforts to develop ties with other organizations, including grassroots citizens groups. With these alliances, they have challenged school practices and pursued a broader range of social intersts.

Court orders for school desegregation either have stimulated the development of citywide organizations or have strengthened them. Examples are the Citywide Education Coalition in Boston and Parents, Let's Unite for Schools (PLUS) in Denver. Both are rallying broad community support for the school desegregation plans in their cities and have helped focus interest on the need for improving educational programs in schools while court-ordered desegregation is in process.

Most citywide educational groups are run by small, professional staffs, and have received local support and some assistance from national foundations for operating costs and for special projects. These groups appear to be effective at networking with other citywide middle-class groups, such as the Urban League and the League of Women Voters.

Local, Grassroots Educational Organizations

There are numerous, local, grassroots education associations, often serving low-income areas. In some cities it was reported that fewer such groups exist now than in the late 1960's. The groups were often created by a dynamic leader. Examples are the late Ida Mae Fletcher, who formed the United Black Parents of the West Side in Chicago; Evalena Antonetti who originated the United Bronx Parents in New York; and Rosa Lopez who founded Parents Involved In Community Action (PICA) in East Los Angeles. Many of these associations have small membership, from 10 to 200 persons. They tend to be parents, mostly mothers, and for the most part drawn from the same racial or ethnic background. Many of the groups are now concen-

trating on functions for which funding is easier to obtain (e.g., research/ evaluation, training and service) than it is for advocacy, electoral politics or monitoring. There are important variations among the cities. Some cities have many such local groups (New York, Detroit, Louisville, San Francisco), while others have relatively few (Atlanta, for example). Their style of operations and their potential impact appear to be strongly influenced by the existing political climate of the city, and its traditions of participation.

Voluntary, Multi-Issue Groups with Educational Agendas

Many multi-issue citizen organizations in cities have, in the past years, paid some attention to school issues. In the cities we visited, such groups continue to work on educational issues. Some multi-issue groups in the communities are local units of national bodies: The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the League of Women Voters, the Urban League, the Urban Coalition, the Junior League, the American Friends Service Committee, and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

For example, many local Leagues of Women Voters conduct studies and projects on school issues. The Portland (Oregon) League recently evaluated the work of the local school advisory committees. 4/ Activities of the Chicago League led to the establishment of a citizen information and training service. NAACP and ACLU groups have often been litigants on behalf of citizens for school desegregation or for other student rights The Urban League has operated alternative schools in several cities.

Other groups are strictly local, unaffiliated with other organizations. Women For in Los Angeles is one important example. This is a politically activist organization based in West Los Angeles which sponsors seminars and training sessions on school issues, monitors school board meetings, supports desegregation, and backs candidates for the school board.

Business Groups

In every city we visited, business interests organized in a variety of ways to influence school policies and spending. The Chamber of Commerce in nearly every city has an Education Committee. These committees vary widely in scope of interests, level of activity, and degrees of influence. In some places, special groupings of business and corporation leaders emerge in relation to school issues.

We note three brief examples. In Chicago, a strong business group, Chicago United, has emerged. It has been reported by most of our interviewees in that city to be among the most influential organizations in school policymaking. Chicago United has a strong, full-time staff director and a broad range of interests. This group clearly has major educational improvement on its agenda, as well as the more obvious issues of

taxes and expenditures.

In Dallas, the Chamber of Commerce and city leadership were responsible for the creation of the Dallas Alliance to deal with a number of pressing urban problems, including education. Their Education Task Force played an important role in the citywide effort to promote peaceful implementation of a court-ordered desegregation plan. The Task Force, whose members are not only businessmen, has played an important role in the "adopt-a-school" plan and in establishing the citywide magnet high schools. In Boston, the Tri-Lateral Task Force--comprised of business leaders--has emerged as the chief mechanism for coordinating business participation in the desegregation plan.

Except in Dallas, however, business groups have generally played a passive role in controversial issues such as desegregation. Our impression is that business leaders in many cities have only minimal interest in the public schools and seek to avoid public criticism of public school officials.

However, individual business and corporate leaders, as well as middle-level managers, play important roles in some cities in the kinds of organizations listed above, especially the blue-ribbon appointed citywide advisory groups. The National Manpower Institute is initiating a pilot program to stimulate and assist Work-Education Councils. This program is "focused on the encouragement of a collaborative project at the local level which will equip participating groups to initiate programs for youth...and to improve the transition between school and work." 5/ The Councils, which number around twenty-five, represent a new but untested vehicle for citizen participation in small, as well as large, school districts.

Local Grassroots Multipurpose Neighborhood Associations

One of the most important new patterns of participation is the emergence of large numbers of neighborhood associations of community residents who have begun to work on their own behalf on a variety of problems and issues. These citizen-initiated groups often sponsor some school-related activity, although education is not typically a primary concern.

The ability of neighborhood association to perform a wide range of functions, use different styles, and to deal with many issues distinguish them from grassroots and citywide educational groups. They are able to define and achieve concrete objectives, such as adding streetlights to a neighborhood, diverting a highway, establishing a health clinic or after-school day care center, or eliminating redlining. In general, records indicate that their specific impact has been much better than that of most school-related groups.

They seem to be more effective in blocking action than in initiating new policies or programs. Their interests tend to be parochial, showing little understanding of the ties between their communities and citywide, state and national forces or decisionmakers. They also seem to chronically be short of money and find fundraising a difficult endeavor.

In Volume II we describe and comment on the work of three such groups: the Southeast Community Organization of Baltimore, the Near Eastside Community

Organization of Indianapolis, and the Heights Community Congress of Cleveland and University Heights, Ohio. These were selected because they seemed to reflect some of the characteristics of other similar neighborhood organizations across the country.

Child Advocacy Groups

One of the fastest growing modes of citizen participation is child advocacy. This has special features that distinguish it from previously discussed citizen participation activities. Strong reliance is placed upon professional staff and legal action. Most child advocacy takes one of two basic forms: (a) case advocacy to protect the rights and interests of individual students on an individual, case-by-case basis, and (b) class advocacy to protect the rights of groups or classes of young people. The techniques of advocacy include litigation, research, investigations and monitoring the administrative implementation of laws, regulations or court decisions.

Many child advocacy groups are non-membership, private, non-profit voluntary organizations. They do not have a set of constituents in the strict sense and they have a potentially open-ended set of clients.

A chapter is devoted to these groups in Volume II. Two examples: (a) the Massachusetts Advocacy Center works both as a statewide group and as a Boston organization to monitor the implementation of such laws as the State's special education program and to study and report on such issues as the inequitable treatment of minority children; (b) New York Advocates for Children (formerly Queens Lay Advocate Service) stresses monitoring state and Federal law to assure due process, fair attendance and suspension procedures and protection of privacy.

WHO PARTICIPATES?

Just as the diversity of forms of participation is impressive, so are the numbers of people who are participating. But the statistics are unreliable. Base line data are hard to locate; current information is only slightly less elusive. Nor surprisingly, the overall quantitative picture is mixed. Voting, the most basic form of individual citizen participation, has declined in school board contests as well as in presidential elections. The National School Volunteer Program reports an unspecified but large increase in local school volunteering. The PTA membership is large (nearly 7 million) but is about half of what it was 15 years ago.

Numbers of Participants

Participation through voluntary association is lower than commonly believed. It is historically true that most Americans do not belong to voluntary associations and are not active in civic life, or in school affairs. Recent studies provide no evidence of change in levels of participation. 6/

Table 5.1. Organizational membership, 1959-74: Percentage of respondents reporting membership in groups. *

Type of organization	Percentage of respondents reporting memberships			
	National sample		Detroit area	
	1959	1971	1959	1971
Fraternal groups	15	14	14	12
Service clubs	6	9	-	-
Veterans' groups	7	9	6	5
Political clubs	8	5	3	2
Labor unions	17	16	28	27
Youth groups	7	10	-	-
School service groups	17	18	19	20
Hobby or garden clubs	5	10	-	-
School fraternities/sororities	3	5	-	-
Nationality groups	2	4	6	4
Farm organizations	4	4	-	-
Literary, art, discussion, or study groups	4	9	-	-
Professional academic societies	7	13	7	8
Church-affiliated groups	6	42	36	28
Business or civic groups	-	-	5	7
Neighborhood clubs or community centers	-	-	8	10
Neighborhood improvement associations	-	-	12	8
Sports teams (clubs)	12	18	11	15
Card clubs, women's or men's social clubs	-	-	12	13
Charitable and welfare organizations	-	-	9	7
Other groups	7	10	-	-

* Mary Jo Bane, Here to Stay. (New York: Basic Books, 1976, See Appendix: Table A-16).

But among local level voluntary associations, groups concerned with schools rank high in terms of membership. 7/ A recent Gallup Poll survey of citizen attitudes toward the public schools asked whether the respondents would be willing to serve on an advisory committee dealing with a school problem. Some 90 percent said yes. 8/ A recent National School Boards Association survey indicated that 75 percent of the Nation's school districts had used at least one citizen advisory committee during the past year. 9/

The most impressive figures of membership are those in the government-mandated school councils and advisory committees: an estimated 1.2 million persons are on the rolls. To reach this figure we relied on the following data: 60,000 Title I Parent Advisory Committees have been formed at the district and school levels. The units involve approximately 900,000 members. On policy boards and policy advisory councils of Head Start and Follow Through there are about 40,000 participants. The advisory committees for other Federal education programs such as bilingual education, education of the handicapped, and the Emergency School Assistance Act comprise some 150,000 persons; county and school councils in Florida have about 20,000 members. Other State and locally mandated advisory commmittees have involved about 75,000 members throughout the country. 10/

However, al these quantitative aspects of citizen participation are far less important than the individuals and groups behind the figures.

The New Participants: The Urban Poor

In the 1960's, the urban poor began to participate on a broad scale; they continue to do so. But in the 1960's these new participants, encouraged by the Civil Rights movement, using aggressive tactics, backed by Federal legislation and program dollars, and addressing fundamental issues, created a kind of crisis--a major challenge to established authorities, including those who ran the schools.

In most cities, most of the new participants were black; many were also Puerto Ricans and Chicanos. The black people who came to the cities in the nineteenth century, World War I or II, or the Depression, found established political structures closed to them. Despite efforts of many to assimilate themselves in the urban mainstream, little progress was made until the Civil Rights movement in the 1960's established a place for black people in urban political culture. Political advancement through the machine had been controlled by white bosses and ethnics who were suspicious of blacks and their demands. Since the route to power and influence followed by earlier European immigrants was closed, the growing minority population was forced to devise new political strategies after a lengthy period of frustrated quiescence.

This new style of political activity relied less on "divisible benefits" offered to ethnic leaders and parcelled out to a constituency and more on "indivisible benefits" obtained for a group as a whole. The failure of the minority constituency to profit from the advancement of its few spokespeople in the political establishment led to the new style of activism which has come to characterize much of urban political activity. It

stresses minority rights and agency obligations as legitimate, not having to be earned in party caucuses or at meetings of the "old boys' club."

Ethnic activism, which grew more common to black and Hispanic politics in northern and western cities during the 1960's differs from "bossism" in that it: focuses on the minority's collective problems, not on discrete personal problems; it aims to bridge the gulf by extending agency services deep into the ethnic community, not piecemeal favors; it seeks to mobilize the ethnic community into broader coalitions of civic involvement, not to eliminate disparate fragments of power; it finds its legitimacy in moral and legal concepts of minority rights and agency obligations, not in the personalism attached to the patron role and not in the attribution of monolithic influence to partisan politics as in the boss role. 11/

New Participants: Immigrant Streams

The change in Federal Immigration laws in 1965 has produced significant new settlement patterns in U.S. cities. 12/ Boston has new concentrations of Haitians, Cape Verdeans, Latin Americans, and newly arrived Hong Kong Chinese. In Atlanta new arrivals are Asians and Caribbean Latin Americans. New York and San Francisco continue to serve as major points of entry for new immigrants.

Increased Federal initiatives and changes in immigration laws have had marked implications for the urban scene. The new immigrants do not appear to have followed the traditional route, i.e. forming voluntary associations. Consequently, they do not seem to have achieved much political influence. 13/ These new groups usually were not mentioned by the decisionmakers and organization leaders whom we interviewed in our field visits. They are not yet taken seriously. In the next few years, however, citizen-initiated organizations certainly will form and client communities will begin pressing for some action on their special educational needs -- bilingual education is the most probable mobilizing issue. It is probable that future political activity will reflect the "ethnic activism" style now characteristic of other minorities in cities.

New Participants: White Ethnics

In the 1960's, participation by urban minority poor people in "movements", in citizen-initiated groups, or mandated councils helped to stimulate the activism of white ethnics, who have become increasingly active over the past few years. The rise of white ethnic, grassroots political activism has been widely discusses and documented. 14/ Central to participation in councils or in citizen-initiated groups are community pride and group identity. Like minority groups in cities, members of white, ethnic communities often consider themselves underrepresented at the decisionmaking and policy setting levels of government. Their response, to form community groups or to serve on committees, resembles the strategies of minorities and immigrants in the past. In contrast, minority citizen groups often made up the constituency for ethnic leaders who had made important gains in city electoral politics.

White ethnic activism has emerged in two forms. Positively, it aims to attract important public and official attention to the problems of

a neighborhood or a school. Negatively, it seeks to gain for whites what has been seen as gratuitously offered to blacks and other minorities at the expense of white people. Writers speaking for white ethnic groups regarded the Federal reforms in response to civil rights demands for blacks as changing the rules of the game. The provision of Federal funds to ease the adjustment of blacks and later, Spanish-speaking groups, angered members of other ethnic groups whose own rise was based on the belief that in order to succeed in America, they would have to give up their ethnic heritage and conform to the cultural and behavioral patterns of the dominant group--which for the most part, was what Novak calls the "WASP culture." The impact of policy is primarily economic since the provisions for blacks and Hispanic groups came just at the time when they were beginning to secure their positions--even though they were not very high up the ladders. 15/

In relationship to the schools, busing and desegregation triggered the development of many local organizations and drew substantial numbers of white ethnic participants, as well as other white people without strong ethnic identification.

Most of today's white ethnic groups appear interested in issues such as housing, jobs, health, taxes, highway construction, care of the elderly, juvenile delinquency, and airport noise. Some of these groups' objectives may be inimical to the aspirations and efforts of the non-white organizations from which the leaders learned much about politics and strategy.

The potential exists among diverse minority and white organizations for building temporary alliances and coalitions on some issues; however, this potential is seldom put to effective use. One cross-race and cross-ethnic alliance formed in Boston in the winter of 1977, when citizens banded together to defeat the mayor's city charter revision plan. Not only were ethnic and racial boundaries crossed, but class and ideological rifts were also bridged.

We have talked to several parent leaders, white and black, who recognized that the inadequacies of urban schools affected all poor and working-class children: the rigidities of the school system were a common foe. Some of our respondents view cultural pluralism, resting on a base of bilingual and multicultural education in the schools, as a way to unify the interests of white ethnic and black communities as well as Spanish-speaking and other minority populations.

New Participants: Suburban Activists

Urban activism in the 1960's and the 1970's contributed to yet another related phenomenon--the unprecedented middle-class activism in surburbia and small towns. Parents and other citizens combined the lessons of effective protest and antipoverty organizations with tactics learned from the antiwar and consumer movements. Many of these white, middle-class, citizen-initiated organizations stress the need for information, communication, and increased contacts between parents and schools. In Atlanta, during one of our field study visits, we learned that in suburban middle-class residential rings around the city there is more organized citizen activity related to schools than within the city itself. Black middle-class parents who have moved

to the suburbs have organized to represent their interests to the white-controlled suburban school districts on such issues as the hiring of black teachers and administrators and equality in the administration of discipline to students regardless of race.

Traditional Patterns Persist

However, despite these new developments, traditional patterns of participation appear to be persisting in the 1970's. All the evidence we have confirms that more women than men continue to participate in school affairs despite the fact that decisionmaking in school affairs is predominantly a male enterprise. Males hold all but a handful of superintendency positions and 88 percent of the school board seats; a heavy majority of urban teachers are men, as are union directors and presidents, and most of the key legislators on city councils, State legislatures, and in Congress. It is our impression that male decision-makers in education are less influenced by citizen participation when the spokesperson is a female rather than a male leader. This impression should be regarded as an interesting hypothesis to be explored. 16/

We also have strong, but incomplete evidence that well-educated, middle-class people in white-collar families continue to dominate the ranks of citizen participants. Upper-class elites, for the most part, have left the explicitly political arena but continue to exercise indirect power and influence over schools. Persons from this background are less prominent on city school boards now than they were several decades ago. However, through volunteer assignments and assistance to school boards, their presence is still felt in most communities.

Lack of Young Participants

There is today a conspicuous lack of youth participation, in contrast to community activism of the 1960's. Through the 1970's to date, American youth have not participated in many of the current contests for power or influence. We have found few examples of student or youth participation in either citizen-initiated or mandated groups working on school issues. There is little evidence of independent student movements aimed at shaping school policies. Some student representatives serve on mandated councils in several communities, but their presence is yet to be felt.

The lack of student and youth involvement may explain, in part, the absence of mass-based, popular, national movements common to political activity a decade ago. Alternatively, the lack of such a movement may explain the non-participation of young people. Whatever the cause-and-effect relationship between these observations, and regardless of other explanations offered for the lack of youth involvement, it is clear that current citizen efforts at social change lack the energy and fresh perspective which young people brought to their work in politics ten years ago. Young people's involvement appears to have sharpened the demands of citizen participants in the past, presenting a participatory front-line less likely to be coopted in favor of authorities.

Some observers have noted the value of young people's participation

in school desegregation and voting rights movements in the South in the early 1960's. Pressures placed on authorities by young people elicited official responses, which threw into vivid focus the issues regularly debated in the dispassionate language of the law and public policy. As political actors or "free agents," the students had more to gain and less to lose than the adult activists who were challenging the power structure. Their youth gave them greater tactical latitude and hence greater effectiveness. Weinberg notes that:

> College and high school students became the prime movers of new currents of energy in the South... Immense efforts were invested in voter registration campaigns during 1961-1965. In Mississippi, black student leader Robert Moses explains SNCC's decisions to depend on youth:
>
> > In general, anybody who had a specific economic tie-in with the white community could not be counted on when the pressure got hot. Therefore our feeling was that the only way to run this campaign was to begin building a group of young people who would not be responsible to any sector of the white community and would be able to act as free agents.
>
> In this process, students were beaten and jailed, but usually bounced right back. 17/

Students and young people made important contributions to the other major movements of the 1960's--consumerism and the antiwar struggle. Once again, it appears that progress toward attaining the goals of one movement was intimately linked with youth participation. It is significant today that few school activists are students or young people, even though they are the ones most immediately affected by decisions of educational officials and professionals.

Underrepresentation of Minorities in Educational Decisionmaking

Barriers to participation are sometimes formidable. The most significant fact which emerges in answering the question, Who Participates? is that minority group members continue to be markedly underrepresented. The same underrepresentation is true of white working-class people as well. This chronic problem persists even in the new mandated school councils and advisory committees where minority participation might be expected. The causes appear to be several.

First, differences in culture and language can impose an invisible barrier which makes minorities (and other working-class people as well) feel uncomfortable in situations dominated by white middle-class citizens and professional educators. Denial of existing racism and unwillingness to deal with its multiple manifestations has been cited by some minorities in a recent report as a cause for staying away from the often white-dominated citizen advisory committees. 18/

Secondly, the financial costs of participation at times are high; too high for many poor people to afford. A Boston report on the under-representation problem points out that:

> The only reimbursable expense at this time is mileage at the rate of ten cents per mile. Most parents do not have cars and during the evening hours must use either public transportation or taxis. The expenses they incur far exceed the reimbursement they receive. Child care expenses are not reimbursable. For many parents, particularly minority parents, participation is a luxury they cannot afford. 19/

Opportunity Costs

A third factor may well be that the difficult conditions of life for many poor people work against participation. For many Americans of all income levels and social status, there is little if any time and energy left over to devote to political activity after working, caring for the family, and coping with the exigencies of daily life. This limitation is particularly true for those persons surviving near or below the poverty line, for whom getting-by is a problem more difficult and energy-sapping than for persons more privileged.

Alienation

A fourth cause is the absence of a feeling of "ownership" of the problem and a consequent sense of powerlessness and alienation. Many minority persons choose not to participate in mandated advisory groups because they recognize that the groups have little, if any, genuine power. They know that the possibility of having an impact on an issue is slim. Many see the advisory group processes controlled by others, frequently school administrators, and therefore mostly manipulative.

There are two exceptions which possibly prove the rule. One is drawn from New York City, 1966-1968. The Ocean Hill-Brownsville community control experiment in New York City shows that, if poor people feel a sense of ownership and control over the political process, as they did during that project's life, they will participate at rates equal to or above the levels of middle-class suburbanites. Thirty-six percent of the parents in the community control district attended one to four parent association meetings during the experiment. Eighty-six percent visited the school at least once. 20/

The Urban Observatory in Atlanta has provided interesting evidence. One study indicated that in all economic groupings, blacks were participating with greater frequency than were whites. 21/ This is not surprising, given the visible presence of blacks in Atlanta city politics. Our own studies in Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles are allowing further exploration of the relationships among class, race, and participation.

Summary and Conclusions

Such data lend support to the idea that political participation among poor and minority persons will increase if people believe that they are strongly and personally affected by the presence and the resolution of problems, and if they feel that they can contribute to working out such problems in acceptable ways. Even more than for middle-class persons, minority and poor people must perceive immediate or at least tangible benefits from involvement before they will act. Such benefits could be as general as economic improvement or as specific as finding a job or getting a break for their children.

IN WHAT ISSUES?

Citizens participate because they feel strongly about something. The something is usually a problem or an issue. These problems and issues, large and small, motivate and shape citizen participation, often determining who participates and in what ways. The most fundamental issues of schooling can be grouped under the three headings: budget, personnel and program. When citizen participation is directed at aspects of these issues, as it was in the community control movement of the 1960's and in school desegregation in the 1970's, citizen interest is most likely to be mobilized and the opposition of educators and school officials aroused.

The current catalogue of interests that mobilize citizens in the 1970's is much the same as it was in the 1960's. All are encompassed under the three fundamental issues of budget, personnel and program.

Our interviews in seven cities in 1976-77 indicated that the primary issues for citizen organization leaders and school districts are the following (not necessarily in order of importance):

- Desegregation
- Money (including the financial consequences of declining enrollment and taxes)
- Bilingualism and cultural pluralism
- Control and decisionmaking (including labor relations and collective bargaining)
- Reading and other basic skills
- Discipline, student behavior and control

In addition to these broad and continuing areas of citizen and educator concern, there is another level of concrete and immediate problems and concerns, micro-issues. These have a wide range of objectives--installing a traffic light at a busy school intersection, initiating an individualized reading program in the primary grades, obtaining a free school breakfast program, establishing a community-based youth counselling program

on drugs and alcohol, painting and fixing up an old school building, or hiring a bilingual aide for the school library.

These can be seen as school-related versions of the problems with which neighborhood associations have been dealing effectively in many cities--fixing potholes, improving street lighting, upholding zoning laws. These kinds of issues seem to be predominant with many citizen groups, especially the mandated councils and committees. There is a decided turning inward of citizen interests toward individual programs (e.g., Title I, California's Early Childhood Education Program) and individual schools. However, many of these are manifestations of larger issues of budget, personnel and program. This emphasis reflects a decision on the part of many citizen organizations to give priority to small but achievable goals. It also indicates frustration about influencing citywide boards of education and central school administrations on major citywide policy matters. Consequently, these micro-issues are neither apolitical nor unimportant.

Factors Shaping the Issues

Many of the issues are set and shaped by three external conditions: legislation, court action, and external developments such as inflation.

Legislation often sets the issues. Federal and State laws or executive regulations and programs have developed as major influences on the local issues of interest to citizens. The laws and regulations also affect the modes of participation. Legislation creates questions and issues: How will the available funds and new jobs be determined? Is the program being implemented effectively and rapidly enough? How can the level of Federal or State funding be increased? How will programs be evaluated, and by whom? Local examples of each of these kinds of issues were reported in nearly every city we visited.

The narrow categorical nature of many of the Federal programs often aimed at limited groups of children in specified schools encourages emphasis on small-scale micro-issues. In addition, the participatory mechanisms mandated in these programs, as in Title I, have limited scope and power, which encourages participants to give priority to small problems within the fixed boundaries of possible success.

Judicial action can also provide the context for issues. Each important court decision affects local issues and the style of citizen response. Certainly the courts have provided a context in which citizen-clients can address their concerns with increased confidence. The Lau vs. Nichols decision in California, for example, legitimized efforts of racial and ethnic groups to gain adequate and more extensive bilingual educational programs. Court decisions similarly shape the financial issues citizens are concerned with, as legislative decisions about school finance plans must often meet State court guidelines on equitable spending.

Desegregation is Predominant Issue

Substantial discussion of all issues is beyond the scope of this report.

However, one of them--desegregation--is discussed briefly here because of its overriding social importance and because it helps to illustrate the interrelationships between who participates, the ways they participate, the functions of organizations, and the issues of concern to the participants.

School desegregation is the predominant issue in the cities across the country. It is responsible for more extensive and diverse forms of organized citizen activity than any other issue and it pervades nearly all problems currently confronting communities. The problem of racism and the elimination of its institutionalization in schools is discussed in our report entitled Federal and State Impact on Citizen Participation in the Schools, in which we provide details of citizen responses to school desegregation in Louisville, Boston, Denver, and Dallas.

Court action to desegregate the schools has been necessary only because political leaders, school boards and school officials have been unwilling or unable to achieve desegregation voluntarily. Often, the political leaders, school boards and school officials have not only failed to provide positive leadership but have evaded or obstructed desegregation, and made decisions that create more rather than less segregation.

Role of Citizen Groups

From the beginning, school desegregation has required extraordinary and persistent efforts by the aggrieved parties and their advocates and allies. The resistance of decisionmakers at the Federal, State and local levels has been substantial and continuing. When desegregation arrives, poor and working-class blacks, whites and other minorities carry the heaviest burden of undoing decades of either de jure or de facto segregation. Demagogic political leaders have skillfully exploited this fact.

In nearly every city facing desegregation strong and active anti-busing groups have formed; ROAR in Boston and Bus Stop in Los Angeles are examples. These groups used a wide variety of strategies including protests, marches, information campaigns through mail and telephone, and alliances with political office holders. In some instances, such as the Ku Klux Klan activity in Louisville, direct intimidation was used: in other places rock throwing and bus burning were the chosen scare tactics. These anti-busing groups attracted new participants, including many working-class whites and white ethnic parents who previously had not sought to influence school policies.

Citizen Participation to Support Desegregation Required

To offset the influence of anti-busing and antidesegregation organizations, and to lend legitimacy to citizens supporting school desegregation, the courts have adopted policies encouraging citizen participation. Mandated citizen advisory groups have accompanied most desegregation plans approved by the Federal courts since 1970. By requiring citizen participation, the courts also may be seeking to assuage local alarm and their own misgivings about the already substantial degree of Federal intrusion into local school affairs. In some cases, the participatory mechanisms required in court

decisions may be viewed as a means for reestablishing the lost ties between the schools and their constituents.

Robert Dentler, a court-appointed expert under Judge Garrity, however, has noted that the rationale for judicial policy is not apologetic. Explaining that intimate ties between schools and communities frequently "perpetuate a mosaic of local advantages that were, in the aggregate, sources of overall inequities under the 14th Amendment," he posits three other derivations for judicial participatory requirements:

1. Over time, improvements in planning efforts for desegregation revealed the value of citizen contributions to the process.

2. Disenchantment with the remedial proposals offered to courts by school boards and headquarters professionals indicated a need for less exclusionary policymaking.

3. Equal protection of rights under the Constitution, it was realized, required reform of the typical relations between public schools and citizens.

In brief, the necessity for a powerful, legal sanction for participation derives from the traditional resistance of school boards and school professionals to public participation. Participation required by court orders or stimulated by desegregation has emerged as a new, strong, and pervasive challenge to professional domination of decisionmaking in the schools.

The evidence we have gathered in four cities--Boston, Dallas, Denver, and Louisville--is that citizen participation through both court-mandated and citizen-initiated organizations serves a wide range of functions. These are often focused especially on mobilization of public support (information function), but also include planning and development of desegregation plans, and planning for educational improvement, child advocacy, and protection.

Such functions were undertaken by a wide variety of organizations. Citywide committees are the most prevalent form of mandated participation. Such groups, as in Boston and Denver, were predominantly elite, blue-ribbon groups including well-known business, civic and university leaders. They often included people who lived outside the city school district itself. The effectiveness of these groups rests on their direct access to the traditionally inaccessible judges and to other local and State leaders.

Of the four cities studies, only Boston has a multi-tiered structure of mandated citizen participation, with councils at the building, district, and city-wide levels. These councils perform all the identified functions except developing the desegregation plan and child advocacy, although in a number of cases they have been involved in student safety problems.

Other structures include: the PTA in Denver; Citywide Education Association (Citywide Education Coalition, Boston); local, grassroots education organizations (United Black Protective Parents, Louisville); other affiliated and independent multi-issue groups (Leagues of Women Voters in each

city; Freedom House, Boston); business groups (Tri-Lateral Task Force, Boston; Chamber of Commerce, Dallas); grassroots neighborhood associations (Mission Hill Task Force, Boston); child advocacy groups (Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Boston).

Desegregation also demonstrates nearly every strategy of participation: research, public information and education, mass rallies, parent organizing and training, monitoring school boards, litigation and legal assistance, direct services to constituents and electoral politics.

In many instances, the issue attracted formerly uninvolved individuals or groups in support of desegregation (or at least in support of carrying out the Federal court order). Important among these "new" participants in school affairs were businesses and businessmen and women and colleges and universities who had previously been little involved in local public school affairs. Court-ordered pairings of schools, districts, and universities in Boston is one example of an effort to open an urban school district to new resources and influences. The active participation of business leaders in Dallas is reported to have been vital to the peaceful implementation of the desegregation order there and to rallying public support for the public school system.

SUMMARY: INTERRELATIONSHIPS

The dynamics of the relationships among the factors discussed in this chapter have been studied hardly at all. Our own study in three cities will provide insight into how forms, function, participants, and issues are interrelated. However, there are three points that are important to make in this preliminary status report.

The Dynamics Vary from Place to Place

The first point is that the dynamics differ markedly from city to city. City and State politics affect school politics. Local, State and regional social and political history and tradition affect how people organize, what functions they serve, the different ways in which different issues are addressed. For example, in Chicago we were told repeatedly that the existence of a strong political machine in that city (Mayor Daley was still alive at the time of our data gathering visit) reduces the number and vitality of citizen organizations in school affairs and limits their functions. In Los Angeles, a long-standing state and local tradition of populism is reflected in an extraordinary number of mandated citizen organizations, temporary and continuing, citywide and at the building level.

Another example is that in some cities, particularly Atlanta and Los Angeles, a few key individuals appear to be more important than particular organizations and appear to use a variety of organizational forms depending on the issue and the particular objectives sought.

Issues Shape the Dynamics

A compelling, emotion-laden issue produces changes in the forms and

functions, and in the nature of participants. In Boston, long known for its closed, centralized school system with little citizen participation, new organizations and activities proliferated when court-ordered desegregation became a reality. New participants (including working-class parents, both for and against the implementation of the court order) emerged, along with new citizen-initiated groups, new programs formed by existing groups, and an extensive network of court-mandated parent councils. The functions being served became more inclusive. Because of this highly controversial issue and the resulting national attention which was focused on Boston, outside funding--foundations, businesses, State and Federal--became more easily available for carrying out these varied functions. (This is an interesting counter example to the earlier suggestion that mandates tend to siphon off citizen participation.)

Technical and Professional Forms and Functions Predominate

At present, if measured by sheer numbers of groups and people, the predominant form of citizen participation (apart from traditional parent associations), is mandated advisory committees and school councils. These appear to have a technical and professional style of operating. By this we mean a style which stresses orderly procedures such as agenda prepared in advance, adherence to Roberts Rules of Order, emphasis on development of by-laws, and formal presentations by experts at meetings. In addition, the organizational maintenance function often receives heavy emphasis along with those functions which are predominantly verbal--information, planning, research and evaluation. Local mandated councils appear to have similar characteristics to professional educators' organizations.

It is our impression that these styles of operation make more difficult the effective participation of working-class parents and other citizens. This point is included, even though there are no firm data that we can locate, because of its relationship to the thematic question that frames this report: Are opportunities for participation in decisionmaking being expanded and are these opportunities leading to increased power sharing for those who are now least powerful in the society?

ORGANIZATIONAL CENSUS

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
Advocates for Children of New York	New York, N.Y.	single-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
La Alianza Hispana	Boston, Mass.	multi-issue, bridging cultural gaps	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Alliance for Children	New York, N.Y.	single-issue, educational politics	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Arriba Juntos	San Francisco, Calif.	multi-issue, Hispanic interests	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Asian American Education Commission	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue, bilingual educ.	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
ASPIRA of New York	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, child advocacy	citywide	voluntary	affiliated
Association of Alternative Public Schools	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Atlanta Council for Public Education	Atlanta, Ga.	single-issue, school-community councils	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Belknap Parent Group	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Black Leadership Forum	San Francisco, Calif.	multi-issue, politics	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Black Parents for Quality Education	Detroit, Mich.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Canfield-Crescent Heights Community School	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue	school-building based	voluntary	non-affiliated
Carthay Center School Parents Advisory Council	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue	school-building based	mandated	---
Citizens Association for Neighborhood Schools	Denver, Colo.	single-issue, anti-busing	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
Chicago P.T.A.	Chicago, Ill.	single-issue	school-building based	voluntary	affiliated
Chinese for Affirmative Action	San Francisco, Calif.	multi-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Chiness Parents Association	Boston, Mass.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Citywide Coordinating Council	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, desegregation process	citywide	mandated	---
Citywide Education Coalition	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, desegregation and school reform	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Citywide Parents Advisory Council (CPAC)	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, desegregation	citywide	mandated	---
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, child advocacy	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Citizens Committee on School Integration	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue, school desegregation	citywide	mandated	---
Citizens Education Workshop	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue, public's involvment	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards (CICSB)	Denver, Colo.	single-issue	nationwide	voluntary	non-affiliated
El Comite de Padres	Boston, Mass.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Community District Advisory Council (CDAC)	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, school desegregation	districtwide	mandated	---
Community Education Council (CEC)	Denver, Colo.	single-issue, monitoring school desegregation	citywide	mandated	---
Community for Education Excellence (CEE)	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue, community support	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
CORE	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue	citywide	Voluntary	non-affiliated
Community Relations Conference of Southern California	Los Angeles, Calif.	multi-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Community Task Force for Better Education	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue, education	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Community Task Force on Education	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, teacher-child school incidents	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
D.C. Citizens for Better Public Education	Washington, D.C.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Detroit P.T.A.	Detroit, Mich.	single-issue	school-building based	voluntary	affiliated
Early Childhood Site Advisory Committee	San Francisco, Calif.	single-issue, special education programs	school-building based	mandated	---
Economic Development Council	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Education Reform Project (ERP)	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue, minority education	city-statewide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Freedom House	Roxbury, Mass.	multi-issue	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Henry Street Settlement	New York, N.Y.	single-issue, service-oriented	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Hispanic Education Lay Advisory Committee	Denver, Colo.	multi-issue, bilingual education	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Hispanic Urban Center	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue, hispanic education	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Home and School Association	Boston, Mass.	single-issue	school-building based	voluntary	affiliated
Local School Board Association	New York, N.Y.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
Lakeview School Council	Chicago, Ill.	single-issue, local school councils	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Lawyers for Civil Rights Under the Law	Washington, D.C.	multi-issue	nationwide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Louisville Area Interchurch Organization for Services	Louisville, Ky.	multi-issue, program development	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
League of Women Voters	Boston, Mass.	multi-issue, desegregation transition	citywide	voluntary	affiliated
Massachusetts Advocacy Center	Boston, Mass.	multi-issue, child advocacy	statewide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Metropolitan Area Housing Alliances (MAHA)	Chicago, Ill.	multi-issue, welfare and crime prevention	neighborhood	voluntary	affiliated
Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group, Inc. (PIRG)	Boston, Mass.	multi-issue, consumer affairs	statewide	voluntary	affiliated
Mexican American Education Commission (MAEC)	Los Angeles, Calif.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Mission Hill Head Start Program	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, education	neighborhood	mandated	---
Model Cities Scholarship Program	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Morrisania Youth and Community Center	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, service-oriented	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents	Washington, D.C.	single-issue, Title I	nationwide	voluntary	non-affiliated
National Committee for Citizens in Education	Atlanta, Ga.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	affiliated
National School Volunteers Program	Alexandria, Va.	single-issue, service-oriented	nationwide	voluntary	affiliated

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
New York Urban League	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Northside Atlanta Parents for Public Schools	Atlanta, Ga.	single-issue, school desegregation, school closings	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Patch	Atlanta, Ga.	multi-issue, community services	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
Parents for Education Action	New York, N.Y.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
P.T.A.	Denver, Colo.	single-issue, supporting court order	school-building based	voluntary	affiliated
Park East High School	New York, N.Y.	single-issue	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
PICA	Los Angeles, Cal.	multi-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
People Let's Unite for Schools (PLUS)	Denver, Colo.	single-issue, school desegregation	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Progress in Education (PIE)	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue, school desegregation	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Public Education Association	New York, N.Y.	single-issue	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund	New York, N.Y.	multi-issue, advocacy	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Racial-Ethnic Parent Council (RPC)	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, school desegregation	school-building based	mandated	---
Reform Parents Groups	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, school desegregation	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Region IV Citizens Council	Atlanta, Ga.	multi-issue, community development	neighborhood	mandated HUD	---

Classification of Organizations by Type

Name of Organization	Place	Issue Focus	Geographic Scope	Origins	Auspices
Restore Our Alienated Rights (ROAR)	Boston, Mass.	single-issue, anti-busing	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Roosevelt Community School and School Board	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
SPEAK	San Francisco, Cal.	multi-issue, school closings	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Tri-Ethnic Committee	Dallas, Tex.	single-issue, desegregation	citywide	mandated	---
United Black Protective Parents	Louisville, Ky.	single-issue, desegregation process	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
United Bronx Parents	New York City, N.Y.	single-issue	neighborhood	voluntary	non-affiliated
United Neighborhood Houses	New York City, N.Y.	multi-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
United Parents Association	New York City, N.Y.	single-issue, adv./intervention (education)	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
UPKIDS	Detroit, Mich.	single-issue, parent participation	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Urban Coalition	New York City, N.Y.	multi-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated
Urban League	Atlanta, Ga.	multi-issue, school boards	citywide	voluntary	affiliated
Urban League	Chicago, Ill.	multi-issue, school policy	citywide	voluntary	affiliated
U. S. Grant Elementary School - School Advisory Council	Chicago, Ill.	single-issue	school-building based	mandated	---
Washington Street School - School Advisory Council	San Jose, Cal.	single-issue, umbrella for Federal programs	school-building based	mandated	---
Women For	Beverly Hills, Cal.	multi-issue, service-oriented	citywide	voluntary	non-affiliated

CHAPTER III - REFERENCES

1. Eliot Levinson, The Alum Rock Voucher Demonstration: Three Years of Implementation (Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation, April 1976).

2. Felix Gutierrez and Gloria Chacon, The Educational Voucher Intrigue: An Analysis of its Impact on the Alum Rock Community, (Hayward, Calif.: The Southwest Network, May 1974).

3. Mario D. Fantini, Public Schools of Choice: A Plan for the Reform of American Education. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973). For Minneapolis see Ruth A. Aldrich, "Marcy Open School, 1973-1974: Goal Evaluation," Minneapolis, Minnesota Public Schools, Southeast Alternatives Program, June 1974.

4. League of Women Voters of Portland, A Study of Local Advisory Committees in School District #1, Portland, Oreg., March 1978.

5. Dennis Gallagher, "The Work Education Consortium, "Work-Education Exchange 2, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute, spring 1978).

6. The base-line study is: Charles R. Wright and H.H. Hyman, "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review, June 1958. For their followup study which found no increases in membership, see: C.R. Wright and H.H. Hyman, "Trends in Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Replication Based on Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review, April 1977. Furthermore, there is evidence that participation and membership in voluntary associations remains a predominantly middle-class activity: Stephen J. Cutler, "Voluntary Association Membership and the Theory of Mass Society," in Bonds of Pluralism: The Form and Substance of Urban Social Networks, ed. E.O. Lauman (New York: John Wiley, 1973).

7. Sidney Verba and Norman H. Nie, Participation in America (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), p. 42.

8. George H. Gallup, Eighth Annual Gallop Poll of the Public Attitudes Towards Schools. Reprinted in Phi Delta Kappan (October 1976).

9. Research Report 1975: The People Look at Their School Boards National School Boards Association (Evanston, Ill. 1974)

10. The National Center for Education Statistics (May 1977).

11. Lloyd H. Rogler, "The Changing Role of a Political Boss in a Puerto Rican Community," American Sociological Review (February 1974), p. 66.

12. Charles B. Keeley, "Information Policy and the New Immigrant, 1965-1976." Paper presented for the Smithsonian Institute's Research Institute on Immigration and Ethnic Studies, conference on "The New Immigrants," November 15-17, 1976. See Steinberg (1977) IV:A for a summary of the data in Keeley's paper.

13. Ibid.

14. See: Michael Novak, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971), and Andrew Greeley, "The Ethnic Miracle," Public Interest (fall 1976).

15. Lois Saxelby Steinberg, Social Science Theory and Research on Participation and Voluntary Associations: A Bibliographic Essay (Boston, Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, July 1977); see section III, "The Reawakening of Ethnic Consciousness." (This Essay is a separate, but companion, volume to this report.)

16. Research Report 1974: Women on School Boards. National School Boards Association (Evanston, Ill. 1974).

17. Meyer Weinberg, A Chance to Learn (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 100.

18. Quality Education: Changing Definitions and Heightened Expectations, A Report of the Citywide Coordinating Council to Judge W. Arthur Garrity, March 1977.

19. Ibid., p. 7.

20. Marilyn Gittell et al., Local Control in Education (New York: Praeger, 1972), p. 64.

21. Atlanta Urban Observatory, General Survey of Organized Citizen Participation (July 15, 1970).

CHAPTER IV

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION?

Citizen participation--especially the activism of the urban poor and minorities since the 1960's--has had some obvious impact on educational policies at the local, state and national levels. Research evidence detailing the specific results of this participation on school programs is sparse; however, it indicates that citizen participation has beneficial results.

A search for specific evidence showing positive results of citizen participation in schools must be based on specific research objectives. These objectives inevitably derive from the rationale for participation. Attempts to establish a direct cause-and-effect relationship between particular forms of participation and particular outcomes are apt to be fraught with difficulties. 1/ Nonetheless, a search for results of citizen involvement must be attempted in any effort to highlight current patterns of participation.

The impact of citizen participation can be considered in relation to these four areas: impact on school policy, impact on service delivery, impact on student performance, and impact on participants.

There is a considerable consensus among citizens and politicians that participation by citizens can have a positive impact in these areas. In fact, such assumptions are behind Federal and State mandates for citizen participation. However, the results of previous evaluations and studies are frequently ambiguous and conflicting. The methodologies are often incompatible and the results non-cumulative, indicating that much more prior conceptual work remains to be done. As a result of these considerations we suggest caution in judging specific instances of impact. Despite this, some good analyses of impact are available. Two especially sophisticated reports on the impact of parents participating in Federal programs have been written by Robert Yin and Miriam Sherman Stearns. 2/ Another recent and useful summary has been prepared by the late Ira J. Gordon. 3/ These will be considered at a later stage of this chapter.

IMPACT ON POLICY

Citizen groups that get Federal and State laws passed or modified are demonstrating one form of citizen impact on policy. The work of major ci-

tizen organizations such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the NAACP on behalf of the civil rights legislation passed in the 1960's is a striking example of policy impact.

Similarly, citizen organizations working on behalf of handicapped children were instrumental in obtaining new State laws and programs which guarantee individualized planning and programming for handicapped children. Many of these laws require the public schools to serve children hitherto rejected or to pay for costs of their maintenance and education in other settings. They also mandate citizen advisory mechanisms and participation by parents in planning and approving the educational plan for each handicapped child.

Examples from Federal Programs

Federal programs such as Community Action, Head Start, Follow Through and Title I offer good examples of the positive impact of participation on different government policies and the actual output of educational agencies. Citizen activity also helped establish paraprofessional services and bilingual education in the schools. We note some examples of these below:

Community Action Programs

There is some evidence of policy influence by Community Action programs in which the participants pursued a political (rather than a service or economic development) strategy, and were more effective in four specific ways: increase in level of organization in the community and number of demands by residents; increase in percentage of the population that are members of community orgnaizations; increase in petitioning of public agencies by organizations; and success in securing political institutional change. 4/

Robert Yin cites a variety of studies to support a conclusion that "organized forms of citizen participation can and do have an impact on the conduct of local public activities and services," indicating that a stronger policy board has more impact than the weaker advisory committees. 5/

Head Start and Follow Through

The strongest evidence of positive impact on policymaking is found in evaluations of two specific programs originally included in the Economic Act of 1965--Head Start and Follow Through. Studies of parent involvement in Follow Through reveal increasing parent effectiveness and influence in planning and operating local projects. 6/ They demonstrate a connection between the level of parent participation in a local project and the level of institutional change within the project.

A Kirchner Associates study of Head Start found that the program had influence, ranging from minor to significant, in four areas:

- Increased involvement of the poor with institutions, particularly at decisionmaking levels and in decisionmaking capacities.

- Increased institutional employment of local persons in paraprofessional occupations.

- Greater educational emphasis in general on the particular needs of the poor and minorities.

- Modifications of health institutions and practices to serve the poor better and more sensitively. 7/

The report concludes that the Head Start program was more influential in those communities with high parent involvement than in those with low involvement.

Title I

Specific instances of policy influence by Title I Advisory Councils operating at both district and school-site levels were reported in interviews during field visits to Los Angeles and San Francisco, and also by a member of the Federal Education Project of the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law. However, in all cases, the policy influence related to these Federal education programs appears limited to operations of the program itself and does not extend to general school or district policies.

Impact of School Policies

Policy influence is also clearly demonstrated by specific issues such as the choice of school personnel, collective bargaining, the building of school facilities, and actual school programs.

Personnel

Our interviews indicate that citizen influence on the selection of the school principal is cited most frequently as an example of policy impact by government-mandated groups. For example, in Boston, court-ordered parent councils participated, in spring and summer 1976, in the process through which principals are selected. In some instances, the participation of the community is reported to have influenced the final appointments. In Chicago, an elementary school council which combined Title I PAC, PTA, and citizen advisory committee functions reported that it had been instrumental in selecting the principal. In San Jose, a similar claim is made by site council PTA combination groups.

Collective Bargaining

State and local Leagues of Women Voters successfully pressed for a public access provision in California's new collective bargaining statute. In other places, local groups are also pressing to open the bargaining process to public participation. They seek open bargaining sessions in which the school board is required to consult with citizens and in which community representatives may participate in the bargaining or act as mediators in case of impasse.

In Rochester, New York, citizens were successful in their efforts to have the Board adopt a policy providing for a citizen observer-representative to be present during the actual bargaining process. Citizens in Florida backed a successful legislative effort requiring that bargaining sessions be open to the public.

School Facilities

In Atlanta, a low-income, grassroots group successfully pressured the school board to seek and obtain more than three million dollars in Federal construction funds for the building of a new school in their community, composed largely of low-income public housing projects. 8/

In Boston, the Citywide Parents Advisory Committee has succeeded in preventing the implementation of a comprehensive facilities plan for the district, since many parent councils found that it was lacking in data, analysis and planning, and anticipated school closings. At the urging of CPAC, the plan has been sent by Judge Garrity back to school officials for further work.

School Programs

On the basis of many studies conducted in several school districts, Marilyn Gittell concludes that a direct relationship exists between citizen participation and certain policy outputs, such as innovations and program change. 9/

The establishment of alternative schools is one good example of a major program change in public school systems that can be partly attributed to the initiative of parents and the efforts of citizen organizations. In Los Angeles, a group of parents were successful in persuading the school board to adopt a policy of support for alternative schools in four of the eleven subdistricts of the city.

Community groups--with allies and advocates at the national level--must receive some of the credit for the passage of Federal bilingual educational mandates and optional bilingual laws in about a dozen States. The establishment of bilingual and multicultural programs in school curriculums on a widespread basis represents a major policy impact. We note that there appears to be a growing backlash against the ideology and cost of bilingual programs in some States, most significantly in Colorado.

Summary

These examples prove only that policy impact is possible. Our overall conclusion, however, has been that policy impact as a direct consequence of citizen activity participation in the schools is very low. Most of the government-initiated, school-based mechanisms are designed to play strictly advisory roles, and the possibility of policy influence is minimized. In Head Start, the genuine influence of the parent policy boards tends to be high. In other Federal educational programs the picture is

mixed, but when advisory committes do have strong influence it is limited to a particular Federal program. Moreover, reports from various communities we have studied indicate that citizen initiated organizations with policy influence are fewer in number and have lower participation levels than those operating five to ten years ago.

Despite the evidence that policy impact is scattered and limited, the newly created mandated groups do provide the opportunity for citizens to take part in the policymaking process. This is particularly important in the case of working-class parents. The mandated citizen groups required in Federal and State programs for low-income children offer such parents official mechanisms for participation which did not previously exist.

Court decisions and laws resulting from the work of citizen groups offer the most striking examples of policy impact in education. Policy impact in specific cities, caused by particular forms of citizen participation is usually evident on a one-time, ad hoc basis (e.g., deciding on whether or not to close or build a school, or setting the year's priorities for Federal or State programs).

However, our interviews indicate high, continuing resistance to strong citizen influence in most major policy areas. School boards, administrators and teachers' organizations remain unwilling to share power and in some communities, substantial numbers of citizens agree that officials are right to protect their prerogatives. The possibilities for citizens to share decisionmaking power remain high, but to realize that potential, citizen organizations must organize effectively.

IMPACT ON SERVICE DELIVERY

Assessment of the impact of citizen participation on the quality of service delivery should consider both curricular changes and changes in the school's capacity to solve problems and carry out new programs.

Among policymakers, the belief that citizen participation has a beneficial impact on the quality of school programs and services is widespread. This is reflected in Federal and State program mandates, in court orders, and in legislation. Few studies, however, are able to specify the objectives, trace the results of educational programs, or isolate convincing cause-and-effect relationships. As Yin points out, "It is impossible to identify the increment of effectiveness due to participation." 10/. However, he concludes that there is good reason to believe that parent participation and the quality of school services, measured partly by student achievement, are meaningfully related.

> Boards with...greater authority have more impact and thus devolve more power. With that power comes greater program effectiveness and, if not reduced alienation, at least an increase in the participants' knowledge and skills. 11/

Interviews with 443 program officials in selected HEW programs with public participation in 18 cities by Community Change, Inc., showed that 27 percent

of the respondents thought that the scope and type of services offered had improved; 14 percent thought that community awareness had increased; 80 percent identified no negative consequences of participation. 12/

Paraprofessionalism: Individual Participation Can Lead to Increased Capacity of Schools

An example of policy impact overlooked in much of the literature is the adoption of the use of paraprofessionals in many aspects of school service. Citizens participating in several of the antipoverty programs (e.g., Model Cities, Community Action and Head Start) exerted pressure for new jobs for the poor in the schools. The Office of Education's Career Opportunities Program also legitimized the concept and provided the necessary funds. Further, it required community participation in planning and installing paraprofessional and "career ladder" programs. 13/ The paraprofessional and career ladder concept has been firmly established in urban (and some rural) school districts across the country and has been embraced by the teachers' organizations; these have sometimes competed to organize the new school workers.

Collective Participation: Mandated and Voluntary Citizen Efforts to Improve Service Delivery

California: ECE

The largest single effort at service delivery improvement is the California Statewide Early Childhood Education Program. This mandates a site advisory council in every school participating in the State-funded program. It also includes provision for parent involvement. The initial evaluation of the program, despite some inner contradictions, showed that the parent involvement component was quite successful. 14/ A new State law (AB.65) extends this concept to all grade levels.

Chicago

In one Chicago school, the citizen advisory council operates with a committee of the PTA. Both the PTA president and the chairman of the advisory council report that their focus is on "projects that will help to improve our school. We are not trying to challenge the policies and practices of the school system." Both respondents expressed a sense of powerlessness on policy matters; they cited, as the cause, fierce resistance to parent influence by the central board of education, the teachers' organization, and the superintendent's staff.

Neighborhood Associations

Neighborhood associations (which we discuss in Volume II) have a similar focus on activities to improve the delivery of services in many areas of community life, including education. Many of these groups see home, school, and community problems as inseparable. They stress objectives such as improved counseling programs for high school dropouts. Some of these involve students in projects aimed towards building community pride and enriching the school curriculum. For example, in San Francisco, the Chinese

Affirmative Action group serves the Chinese community--not just that part living within Chinatown, but others living elsewhere in the area. This group combines advocacy, community education and political organizing, and seeks to motivate its constituency to involve themselves more deeply in school affairs, especially in the issue of bilingual education. Another San Francisco association, Sunset Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK), has established community educational programs using public facilities and offering programs for young people as well as adults.

IMPACT ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE

The belief that parent involvement in the schools, especially in educational programs serving poor children, will improve the school performance of students has been one of the primary reasons for opening schools to citizen participation. Our field interviews revealed that this belief is shared by a surprisingly diverse range of individuals and role groups in education.

Both Federal and State legislators and legislative staff state that the improvement of childrens' performance in school is one of two main reasons for supporting mandates for citizen participation in program legislation. The other reason is that citizen participation provides a positive means for undercutting the absolute authority of local school officials.

Parents themselves usually suggest that the improvement of student performance is their primary motive for participating. Citizen organizations--both citizen- and government-initated--which are focused solely on education include the improvement of student performance as their first objective. Most administrators we have talked to seem to believe that parent involvement aids student performance in the schools.

The pervasiveness of this conviction has prompted a considerable research and evaluation effort to trace the effects of various kinds of citizen participation on student achievement. As we have noted before, it is difficult to show the relationship between a single factor (citizen participation) and a single student performance criterion (e.g., scores of reading tests, attendance records). Title I program evaluations have been consistent in finding little difference between the performance of participants' and nonparticipants' children. To expect that one component of these programs--citizen participation--will produce discernible cause-and-effect impact, while the overall design of the programs produces only marginal or limited impact, is clearly unrealistic.

Studies of Parent Participation

Four important studies dealing with the effects of parent participation on childrens' school performance have recently been conducted. Miriam Sherman Stearns believes, "there is considerable evidence that it (parent participation) can work to improve student performance...(but) the direct evidence to date that it does work is scanty or non-existent for most types of participation." 15/

Stearns' sophisticated analysis of the evidence highlights these points:

- Involving parents as trainees and tutors can improve children's performance.

- Positive impact on preschool children participating in programs has been demonstrated with community residents work as school paraprofessionals. There are some informal data on the impact of this kind of participation on school-age children's performances, but the studies have been limited and the results are ambiguous.

- A Head Start study in Denver repeated the Coleman Study finding that higher levels of parent involvement for preschool children were associated with a higher level of achievement.

Harriet Spivak reports on five studies which represent achievement data in relation to decentralization and community control interventions. 16/ The resulting picture is inconclusive. Reading scores improved dramatically in one grade in the Morgan School in Washington, DC, but declined slightly in another. 17/ Results from New York's Community School P.S. 133 in the I.S. 201 district showed impressive pupil achievement gains, while the Ocean Hill-Brownsville District students' scores declined (parallel to but less than citiwide declines). 18/ Other studies showed students performing at about the same level, with no significant changes up or down. Of course, in these studies and others, it is difficult to know what specific aspects of the results are directly attributable to various kinds of citizen participation. 19/ The New York experiments did not last long enough to provide a reasonable test.

A significant, recent RAND study of the "School Preferred Reading Program" in selected Los Angeles minority schools produced interesting findings. In black communities pupil reading gains appeared to be related to the level of parent involvement in the schools. In Mexican-American communities, no such relationship was found. 20/

The authors note that the school in the Mexican-American sample which seemed to have the most effective reading program (actually measured by the holding back of relative loss in reading scores) was also the school with the highest degree of school-community integration and the greatest awareness of school issues among monolingual Spanish-speaking parents. The fact that this positive relationship is not found in other sample Mexican-American schools is explained by two factors:

1. Language may be creating barriers to prevent parent/community effectiveness.

2. The immediate survival and economic needs of the Mexican-American community may, at times, be more salient that specific concerns about classroom instruction.

The RAND study reports on one elementary school with relatively high pupil achievement in the black community which had a much higher than usual rate of parent participation and influence. The PAC was involved with the school's reading program from the beginning; it also influenced the naming of both the school and an attached child-care center. Parents have a conference room set aside for their use at all times and have subcommittees that monitor such disparate subjects as curriculum, employment of school staff, and physical plant maintenance. Attendance at parents advisory council meetings is reported to average about 50 persons. 21/

The Leadership Training Institute at Stanford University's Center for Educational Research conducted a six-year documentation and evaluation of the Urban/Rural School Development Program, funded by the Office of Education under the Education Professions Development Act. The program took place in 25 poverty-stricken communities across the country and was built around a school-community council. Part of the analysis involved comparing project sites which achieved a high degree of "parity" (i.e., power sharing by community residents) with those that did not.

Perceptions of pupil achievement varied consistently in two categories between high and low parity sites: 80.8 percent of the high parity respondents indicated that there had been growth in arithmetic skills, contrasted with 61.9 percent of the persons from low parity sites; 87.4 percent of the high parity site members and 71.8 percent of the low parity site members felt there had been growth in pupil awareness of cultural identity. However, the majority in all sites believed that their projects had a positive effect on children's learning. 22/

Summary: What Do the Studies Prove?

The research and evaluations to date do not lead to any clear and unchallengeable set of causal claims about the benefits of citizen participation in relation to student academic performance. Many of the instruments used to gauge student performance are themselves subject to controversy so that judgements based on them remain inconclusive. Yet, despite these unresolved questions about criteria and indicators, the grip of standardized testing on American education seems to grow stronger rather than weaker. 23/ Scores on standardized tests continue to be the dominant criteria of student performance and most evaluation research on the effectiveness of schools.

Debate and contending analyses on these and other questions can and should continue. However, the "right" of citizens to participate in the setting of policies for governing the institutions of their community need not be proved beneficial by social science research or evaluation, any more than we would expect evaluation studies to "justify" continuation of the First Amendment on the basis of data showing that it affects adult reading test scores in a positive manner.

IMPACT ON PARTICIPANTS

Tangible Individual Benefits: Careers and Job Opportunities

There are many individual benefits of participation which we have observed or which were reported to us in interviews. Jobs and job advancement head the list. The antipoverty programs, by design, produced employment and job training for target populations; Head Start is a good example. Citizen participation activities provided individuals with new skills (e.g., interviewing skills, skill in writing and editing a newsletter, ability to talk before a group) which proved to be saleable and often led to a better job. The activities also provided persons with motivation for advancing or changing their careers, and for seeking additional formal education.

Many parent activists have been employed by the schools. We encountered examples of this phenomenon in every city we visited. Critics of schools explain the hiring of parents by the schools as a means of bringing many of the most effective critics inside the system--to quiet and coopt them. There is, as yet, insufficient evidence to prove or disprove this theory.

Intangible Individual Benefits: Increases in Civic Competency

Social science research has demonstrated that group and organizational membership per se leads to increased efficacy. For example, Almond and Verba's cross-national study of "civic participation" revealed that those who were members of organizations, even if those organizations were reported to have no manifestly political role, had more political competence than those who had no such membership. 24/

More specifically, on the basis of a variety of field studies, Gittell hypothesizes that the impact of participation on participants will have the following results:

1. All participants will show increased knowledge and become more specific and articulate about their views on policy.

2. Participation will have the greatest educational impact on those members with the lowest initial educational level and socioeconomic status.

3. Political ideology will not change as a result of participation, but extreme positions will be moderated.

4. Participation will lead to heightened feelings of efficacy and self-esteem. 25/

Evalina Antonetti of the United Bronx Parents, which is one of the best-known grassroots, school-focused organizations in the country, articulates the relationship between school participation and community development as follows:

> We educate the people to know how to understand and change the schools. These same parents become leaders helping to improve all parts of the community.

Others whom we interviewed share this view and told us plainly that they were working in the schools primarily to improve their community.

The Urban/Rural Program assessment identified several areas in which the participatory program had impact on its participants: more persons (community residents) working in the schools, leadership development for participants, more parent interaction with teachers, more parent training in assisting children with school work, and more opportunities for participants to raise their own educational levels. 26/

Community Integration and Decreased Alienation From Schools

There is evidence to support the widespread belief that citizen participation will reduce both individual and group alienation from schools and that it will increase people's sympathy for those schools. In out interviews we found that this belief is held by many school officials, including: superintendents, middle-level school administrators, school board members, Federal and State legislators, and education agency officials. This conviction was also mentioned to a lesser extent in interviews with spokespersons of teachers' organizations. There is evidence which supports the idea that citizen participation (especially that of parents) and satisfaction with and support for the schools go hand in hand. Gittell's findings on the demonstration districts show that 72 percent of the constituents rated their local schools as better since the beginning of the experiment; 52 percent were opposed to the abolition of the demonstration district. 27/

> In an overview of the job assessment given school officials in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experiment, the parents assigned positive ratings of 75 percent to principals, 57 percent to the local governing board, 58 percent to the unit administrator, and 50 percent for the Board of Education. In general, the evaluation given to local leaders and teachers was higher than for citywide educational leaders. 28/

Participation by parents and other community members in a school-community council established as a policy body for the Urban/Rural Program in poverty areas revealed that taking part in the council process itself was educational in the sense that it reduced the disparity between community members and teachers in small group interactions. 29/

In a comparative questionnaire study done as part of the same assessment of the Urban/Rural Program, parents in schools which have experienced the collaborative decisionmaking process displayed the following differences from a control group of California and Georgia parents who did not participate in educational decisionmaking.

1. They were even more favorable toward community participation in the governance of inservice education at the local school level.

2. They had more positive attitudes toward present inservice programs.

3. They were more favorable toward teachers organizations.

4. They supported more options for freeing teachers for in-service education and making it "part of the job." 30/

These results suggest that citizen participation, as we define it in this report, may help to reduce alienation and lack of communication between parents (and other community residents) and teachers and teacher organizations.

The Spillover Effect

Participation in school affairs also leads to work in electoral politics for many individuals. The PTA's and the Leagues of Women Voters have been traditional training grounds and launching pads for middle-class candidates for school boards and city councils. In the 1960's, new opportunities to participate provided similar opportunities for poor people to step into the arena of city politics. The Federal and State education programs are now providing similar opportunities to other poor people.

Gittell, in her study of the New York City demonstration school districts (Ocean Hill-Brownsville, I.S. 201, and Two Bridges), found that many active participants in this experiment in community control went on to participate in other areas of municipal politics. Moreover, many of the participants and leaders of this experiment had prior experience in OEO anti-poverty community-action programs. 31/

Citizen Participation in Education Encourages General Civic Participation

Citizens' concern for schools provides an already existing base for organizations working on other community problems. In fact, in our survey of the literature, school-related organizations account for a surprisingly large percentage of the voluntary associations which have a positive influence. In this category, they are outranked in organizational membership only by churches and labor unions. (See table in Chapter III.)

In this chapter we have examined a variety of specific ways in which citizen participation can influence school related issues. However, since measures of the effects of such participation and of educational achievement itself are still matters for debate and since citizen participation is a right, not an experiment that needs to be justified by research, in the concluding chapter we will offer some overall perspectives on the necessity for strong and continuing collaboration between citizens and educators in the future.

CHAPTER IV - REFERENCES

1. Harriet J. Spivak, Decentralization and Community Control (New York: Center for Urban and Minority Studies, 1973).

2. Robert K. Yin et al., Citizen Organizations: Increasing Client Control Over Services (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corp., 1973) and Miriam S. Stearns et al., Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, August 1973), ED 088 588

3. "What Does Research Say About the Effects of Parent Involvement on Schooling?", Ira J. Gordon. Speech at Annual Convention of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 1978.

4. Charles Brecher, The Impact of Federal Anti-Poverty Policies (New York: Praeger, 1973), pp. 99-101.

5. Robert K. Yin, Citizen Organizations.

6. J.A. Emrick, P.H. Sorenson, and M.S. Stearns, "Interim Evaluation of the National Follow Through Program, 1969-1971," (Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1973).

7. Kirchner Associates, Inc., "A Proposal For a Study of the Impact of Parent Advisory Councils Upon the Management and Administration of Title I Programs at the Local Level," submitted to the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., August 23, 1976.

8. In 1973 the Atlanta Public School System received a Model Cities grant to help with the construction of three new schools. These funds were applied to the King Middle School.

9. Marilyn Gittell, Six Urban School Districts (New York: Praeger, 1968).

10. Citizen Organizations (1973), p. 42.

11. Ibid., pp. 45-46.

12. Robert K. Yin et al., Citizen Organizations (1973), p. 42.

13. George R. Kaplan, From Aide to Teacher: The Story of the Career Opportunities Program (Washington, D.C.: U.S./DHEW, 1971).

14. Wilson C. Riles, "ECE in California Passes Its First Test", Phi Delta Kappan, (September 1975). See also: State Office of Child Development: Early Childhood Report No. 8. (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, September 1975), pp. 9-11 passim.

15. Stearns, Parent Involvement, p. 22.

16. Spivak, Decentralization and Community Control.

17. Sol Gordon and Doris Kassin, The Morgan School, Washington, D.C. (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1971).

18. Richard Schwartz and Ellen Saxl, Beginning Reading and Math in P.S. 133 (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1970).

19. For example, see: Marilyn Gittell et al., Demonstration for Social Change: An Experiment in Local Control (New York: Queens College, Institute for Community Studies, 1971) Diane Ravitch, "Community Control Revisited," Commentary, (February 1972), and Melvin Zimet, Decentralization and School Effectiveness (New York: Praeger, 1973)

20. David Armor et al., Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools (Santa Monica, Calif.: The RAND Corp., August 1976).

21. Ibid., p. 44.

22. Involvement: A Study of Shared Governance of Teacher Education, ed. Bruce R. Joyce (Syracuse, N.Y.: National Dissemination Center, 1978).

23. See the issue on "Testing" in Citizen Action in Education 3, No. 2 (Boston, Mass.: Institute for Responsive Education, March 1976).

24. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Co., 1965).

25. Draft Summary of the Research Design for Task II of Citizen Organizations: A Study of Citizen Participation in Educational Decision-Making. National Institute of Education, Contract #400-76-0115, July 1977.

26. Bruce R. Joyce et al. The Urban/Rural Process: Views of the Participants (Stanford, Calif.: Urban/Rural School Development Program, 1977).

27. Gittell, Local Control in Education (1972), p. 51.

28. Ibid., p. 65.

29. Huguenin, Kathleen M., "The Effect of Parity on School Community Interaction." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.: 1978.

30. Joyce, Urban/Rural Report, p. 64.

31. Local Control in Education, pp. 43 and 132.

CHAPTER V

SUMMING UP

As advocates of citizen participation as the cornerstone of participatory democracy, we have sought to identify signs of progress, notes of optimism, indications of positive impact. We can state with assurance that citizen participation has produced significant benefits and major changes in school-community relations.

We would be happy to read into the patterns that great and positive changes are just ahead, and that a more full realization of participatory democracy will soon be achieved. But we cannot be so optimistic. Three important facts of contemporary life suggest that current confused and contradictory patterns will persist at least for the near term.

First, there is the fact of limited resources--fiscal crises, inflation and a slow growth economy. Second, there is the malfunctioning of the political system at all levels with increasing lack of trust by the people of that system. Third, there is no clear social and political consensus to provide guidance for planning and decisionmaking.

Conflicting Interest Groups Impair the Public Good

Fragmented interest groups compete for scarce resources, the rights and interests of anxious employees collide with the rights of citizens to influence public institutions. Elected and appointed school officials are caught in a whirl of conflicting pressures in a political system which is not well interconnected and is subject both to corruption and inaction. Without a consensus each policy issue and planning decision can be both divisive and immobilizing. The concept of the public good is lost in the clash of private forces.

At the center of this whirlwind are the schools; they are always a major political arena for citizens seeking economic and social as well as educational change.

The day-by-day, school-by-school, community-by-community activities and successes and failures of citizens and citizen groups lay a necessary groundwork for change, in the broadest sense, even though there is no board on which inning-by-inning scores can be read.

As long as participation is seen as advancing the interests of individual rights it is in the safe confines of America's traditional reverence for individualism. The isolated Horatio Alger--whether black, white, brown or yellow--is not very threatening to those in power. It is

when participation becomes a group effort, explicitly or implicitly seeking a re-distribution of social or economic benefits, by group or class that it becomes controversial.

This kind of controversial citizen participation, as discussed in our report, can best be understood as two separate examples of participatory democracy.

The first is that of racial, ethnic groups, or economic classes seeking greater social and economic equity. The second is that of the citizen--the layperson--regardless of race or class, seeking to share the control of public institutions with professionals, elected officials, and experts.

Racial and Economic Groups

Over the past two decades previously excluded or relatively powerless groups have gained opportunities for participation. Federal action has fostered many of these opportunities. Despite the equivocal nature of many Federal mandates they do provide specific and official channels for access that did not exist before. Although these channels fall far short of meeting our tests of participatory democracy and power sharing, they nevertheless exist and have strong potential.

Moreover, the legal framework for the participation of minority and working class people has changed. Federal and State courts have confirmed student, parent, and educational rights on multiple fronts: desegregation, bilingualism, equitable school expenditures, student rights and due process, rights of all handicapped children to educational services, rights of parents to affect educational decisions. Additionally, the ever present threat, litigation, has strengthened the position of minority and working class people.

Partly because of this new legal framework, the Federal government is seen, and often in reality is, the chief protector of these groups in society and the chief instrument for policies that lead toward social change. But there is a dramatic paradox. Federal programs often lead toward the centralization of authority and decisionmaking. Such centralization may tend to reduce, not increase the opportunities for participation by people at the grassroots level. This paradox can be most clearly seen in a program such as Title I, which promises participation for low-income people, but which, because of its size and complexity, presses school systems to centralized and bureaucratic management.

However, from our overall perspective, the Federal position has fostered citizen participation at the local level, especially in making possible participation of the target populations and in changing the climate of school-community relations. No longer can the rights and potential of minority and working class people be safely ignored. Persistent opposition notwithstanding, the mechanism, the legal framework, the leadership, and the potential for increased power sharing are there.

Citizen Challenge to Professional Domination

A related but quite different example of participatory democracy is the citizens' challenge to share control with educators, public officials and experts. This challenge differs from the first in that it is not marked by racial, ethnic and class consciousness. It has less to do with social change and more to do with citizen rights in a democracy. Therefore, there is less economic and social ideology.

This challenge is one of the legacies of the Civil Rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's which stimulated and set the pattern for a series of protest and rights movements, including the consumerism movement, the anti-Vietnam War effort, and the womens' rights movement.

All are serious challenges to lack of accountability and responsiveness by corporations, public institutions and government agencies. At the local level, the challenge often takes the form of neighborhood associations fighting against freeways, pollution, inequitable tax policies or threats to neighborhood stability. These feed at the wellsprings of populism and local control.

Citizen challenge to authority is part of the contradiction between America's populist lack of deference to ascribed status and its historical reliance on the expert and the professional. Both the challenge and the contradiction are important. What does our review of current patterns of participation suggest about the citizen challenge to the expert? The following conclusions emerge:

Citizen participation in education is part of a growing crisis in public confidence in officialdom at every level. Parents and other citizens of all races, groups, and classes have become visibly more skeptical about government and institutions in general, and about schools and professional educators in particular. Rising costs of schooling and rising taxes were not accompanied by demonstrably improved schooling. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, "accountability" became the concept that embodied much of the skepticism. This concept was translated into local and state policies in two important ways: a) wider opportunities for parent involvement, and, in some cases, for participation in decisionmaking and, b) by increased emphasis on testing (national, local and State). Statewide competency examinations are certainly one manifestation of this policy.

Such lack of confidence has been part of the fiscal and resource crisis facing public education. The continuation of public skepticism or alienation about the public schools is certainly one of the factors that is fueling both the taxpayers revolt and the wide variety of organized citizen activities. But both activism and apathy feed on cynicism and lack of trust in public officials and institutions, and both can be seen as strong, conflicting themes in these patterns of participation.

The concept of "consumerism" in public education has been firmly established. In nearly all public policy fields the concept that patients, students, parents and other recipients of public services are "consumers" has become widely accepted. This consumerism concept represents a sub-

stantial change in the climate of school-community relations. It includes the idea that the recipient of services has rights and powers beyond those that the "producer" voluntarily offers. It also includes the idea of "getting one's money's worth," which is a public sector parallel to private sector "productivity."

This consumerism does not mean that there is any readymade consensus on the definitions of "productivity" or the best ends and means of schooling. As noted, community interests remain fragmented and diverse. Some of this fragmentation is spawned by Federal initiatives to support citizen participation. Such initiatives have indeed broadened the class base of participation--have opened up opportunities for low-income and minorities. This was a function of targeting in such programs as Title I. However, targeting also fragments, narrows the scope of citizen participation and creates group competition for ever scarcer resources.

Many parents participate as consumers by exercising "choice" as an alternative to political action. Many choices have long been available to the affluent for the education of their children. These include moving from one district to another, from city to suburb, sending children to private, independent or church-related schools. However, for the majority of people this is largely a mythical choice. Low-income groups do not have the economic freedom to take advantage of choices offered and have, historically, always been dependent on the public school system as a social and economic escalator.

The most viable solution for addressing the choice concept in a practical way is to foster diversity within a highly decentralized public school system, and to assure authentic participation by parents and citizens, and appropriate power sharing between the public and educators. The school based management concept has the potential to address the choice issue in this way, but the idea is only in its early stages of implementation in a few communities.

Consumerism has led to a changed context of professionalism and school governance. Skepticism and consumerism are two forces that have altered the basic conditions of professionalism in the past few years. In the absence of a cultural or even a local community consensus on the functions of schooling, and given our growing realization that there is no one best, scientifically demonstrable way to teach children, professionals are having to admit that their decisions about education are often decisions about values rather than techniques. These decisions are political, not merely technical. In fact, the political nature of nearly all decisions about schooling has now been so clearly established that it is no longer a matter of debate as it was in the period of the "old" or progressive reform in education. This seemingly simple point actually marks a significant shift. It is now legitimate to view citizen participation in the schools as an explicitly political form of participatory democracy that can be embraced by groups seeking political, social and economic benefits. The arguments by school officials and reformers from the nineteenth century to the recent past, that "School should be kept our of politics" was, in reality, used most successfully to prevent minority and working class efforts to participate.

However, the role of school boards continues to be ambiguous within this changed context. American school boards represent one important manifestation of the concept of participatory democracy in 16,000 instances. They provide the public an opportunity to elect representatives to set educational policies, hire and supervise staff, and monitor the results. That the public is largely dissatisfied and confused about their performance and roles is clear from the poll data presented earlier in this report. Most telling is the lumping together in the public mind of school administrators and school board members. This theoretical misunderstanding may be a practical recognition of the domination of school boards by educators, which has developed as a result of the progressive reform movement of the past 75 years.

Collaboration rather than control or adversarial relations is therefore favored by citizen participants. The recognition that school policymaking is political rather than technical need not mean conflict or adversarial relationships must predominate. Time and again our interviews revealed that most parents concerned about the schools are less interested in discussing power than they are in finding ways to work effectively with educators to improve the schools. Collaboration, based on a parity concept, has been demonstrated to be possible and is a goal that is clearly more attractive to many citizen participants than conflict. This should not be viewed as apolitical or antithetical to the concept of participatory democracy. In fact, in the examples we have identified in our study, it embodies the concept of power sharing.

THE SCOREBOARD - WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Citizen participation in school affairs in a wide variety of forms is here to stay. But participation will occur in the context of fiscal austerity, competition for scarce resources and lack of consensus since no one has the one right answer or the "quick fix." There is no such thing as a single "community" or "national interest," any more than there is a one best way to organize the schools and educate children. Hence, school-related questions have to be worked out in a complex democratic process. Such a process recognizes that consensus emerges only out of a full discussion and representation of all interests and their co-involvement in developing better education for the 1980's. Hence the agenda for the future is not control but collaboration. Under present political and economic conditions, strong motivation exists for citizen participation in a collaborative spirit.

Why Collaboration? Schools Can't Do Their Jobs Alone

Lacking the secure knowledge of a "quick fix," and in the absence of community consensus, educators, whether they like it or not, must reach out and welcome participation in order to find out what the public expects from its schools and how to put such expectations into action. School officials and school employee unions both need powerful citizen allies, many of whom will resist offering support without authentic participation and a sense of ownership. This sense of community ownership of the schools is a necessary basis for the political and economic support that schools require in times of tight budgets. The quid pro quo is obvious--people

support only what they have a hand in creating. Such joint ownership adds to the schools' stock of resources, tangible and intangible, particularly pertinent in times of fiscal austerity.

Better Schools for Children Remains Basis for Collaboration

Collaborative relationships are essential for two other important reasons: first, citizen advocates cannot be too far ahead of their constituencies, parents of all classes and races are concerned not with power per se, but with children (better school services and programs); second, one common theme both in our research and in others, is that any school governance reform--any mandate for citizen participation--is apt to be ineffectual, co-opted or even sabotaged in the face of professional resistance.

Therefore we know, even without a scoreboard, what will make citizen participation successful--initiatives and mandates must address themselves to the reality and sources of professional resistance if they are to realize fully their future potential.